

CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

Volume XXXV

JANUARY 1940

Number 1

THE THEORY OF THE FOUR MONARCHIES OPPOSITION HISTORY UNDER THE ROMAN EMPIRE

JOSEPH WARD SWAIN

I

A CELEBRATED passage in the Book of Daniel describes Nebuchadnezzar's dream of a statue, made of gold and silver and bronze and iron and having feet of iron mixed with clay, and of a stone which destroyed the colossus and grew until it filled the whole world. Daniel interpreted the dream as referring to four great monarchies, to be followed by a fifth which would destroy the others and itself stand forever. The idea is repeated a few chapters below in a vision of four beasts, followed by "one like unto a son of man," to whom was given "dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all the peoples, nations, and languages should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed."¹

Modern scholars seem well agreed that the Book of Daniel reached its present form between 168 and 165 B.C.; that it emanated from the struggle of the Jews against Antiochus IV which was then in progress; that the author of these stories was probably referring to the Chaldean, Median, Persian, and Greek monarchies; and that the fifth monarchy, which was to supersede them and last forever, was somehow connected with the anticipated victory of Judas Maccabaeus.²

¹ Dan. 2:31-45 and 7:1-14, esp. vs. 14.

² For a summary of the many identifications of the four monarchies proposed at one time or another see H. H. Rowley, *Darius the Mede and the Four World Empires in the Book of Daniel* (Oxford, 1935).

It is well known that from early times Christian writers took these passages as referring to Christ or to the church; but little attention has hitherto been paid to the fact that this philosophy of history, according to which four great empires would be followed by a more glorious fifth empire, is also to be found in pagan writers long before the birth of Christ and even before the time of Antiochus IV.

In our text of Velleius Paterculus stands a passage which shows how early this theory appeared in the West. It is short and may be quoted in full:

Aemilius Sura says in his book on the chronology of Rome: "The Assyrians were the first of all races to hold power, then the Medes, after them the Persians, and then the Macedonians. Then, when the two kings, Philip and Antiochus [III], of Macedonian origin, had been completely conquered, soon after the overthrow of Carthage, the supreme command passed to the Roman people. Between this time and the beginning of the reign of Ninus, king of the Assyrians, who was the first to hold power, lies an interval of 1,995 years."³

This passage has long been recognized as a gloss, not the work of Velleius himself. We have no way of knowing when or by whom it was introduced into his text, or whence it came; but it clearly is an authentic scrap from an ancient writer. Of Sura himself we know nothing except what the fragment tells us. His name indicates that he was a Roman. The interval of 1,995 years shows his dependence upon the *Chronology* of Eratosthenes and the *Persica* of Ctesias: in putting the foundation of Assyria in 2184 B.C. (1,995 years before Rome established her power in Asia, after Scipio's victory at Magnesia) he followed Ctesias' statement⁴ that Assyria was founded 1,000 years before the fall of Troy, and he accepted Eratosthenes' date (1184 B.C.) for that event. The fact that he considered the Second Punic War—shortly before the defeat of Antiochus III—as the time of the overthrow of Carthage shows that he wrote before the Third Punic War,

³ "Aemilius Sura de annis populi Romani: Assyrii principes omnium gentium rerum potiti sunt, deinde Medi, postea Persae, deinde Macedones; exinde duobus regibus Philippo et Antiocho, qui a Macedonibus oriundi erant, haud multo post Carthaginem subactam deuctis summa imperii ad populum Romanum peruenit. inter hoc tempus et initium regis Nini Assyriorum, qui princeps rerum potitus, intersunt anni MDCCCXCIV" (Vell. Pat. i. 6. 6).

⁴ Ctesias, in Diod. Sic. ii. 22. 2. Of course Magnesia was won in 190, but Sura counted from the year 189, when peace was concluded (cf. E. Schwartz, "Die Königslisten des Eratosthenes und Kastor," in the *Göttingen Abhandlungen*, XL [1894-95], 56, n. 1).

while the mention of Philip as marking the end of Macedonia places him before the Third Macedonian War. We are thus enabled to date Sura between 189 and 171 B.C. We shall see below that the general intellectual conditions in Rome make this date much more probable than a later one; and the slight philological evidence available points in the same direction.⁵

It is also possible to see a reference to this association of Rome with the oriental world-empires in a fragment of the *Annales* of Sura's contemporary, the poet Ennius. It was often the practice of ancient writers to group various events around a single date in order to indicate a supposed inner connection between them—as when it was said that the battles of Salamis and Himera occurred upon exactly the same day,⁶ or that Carthage and Rome were founded in the same year.⁷ This fragment of Ennius, written somewhat before the author's death in 172 B.C., expresses his belief that Rome was founded about seven hundred years before his own time.⁸ The date he had in mind was undoubtedly 880 B.C., the year ordinarily given at that time for the fall of the Assyrian empire. This synchronizing of the fall of Assyria with the founding of Rome was one way of showing Rome as the true successor of Assyria, and it implied a theory of the succession of empires similar to that given by Sura. We shall see that in later times this chronological device was used by writers dealing with the four monarchies; Ennius shows that it was known in Rome even in his day.

It was not long after Magnesia, therefore, that certain Roman writers claimed for their city a place as successor to the world-empires of Assyria, Media, Persia, and Macedonia. Rome's recent victories

⁵ Professor W. A. Oldfather of the University of Illinois has kindly consented to examine this fragment of Sura from the philological point of view. He reports that, while the linguistic evidence is scanty, it suggests an early date, certainly in the republican period, probably before its last years: the use of *princeps* twice to indicate "the first to do a thing" is early, later writers normally saying *primus*; *oriundi* is likewise an early usage; this particular use of *exinde* is rare and early. Although these philological arguments do not prove a date as early as 171 B.C., they distinctly suggest that the passage is "republican" Latin; evidence of other sorts makes the date suggested the only one in republican times that seems at all plausible for Sura's ideas. These considerations are secondary, however, to the chronological argument developed in the text above.

⁶ Herod. vii. 166.

⁷ Timaeus, in Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* i. 74. 1.

⁸ "Septingenti sunt paulo plus aut minus anni, /augusto augurio postquam inclita condita Roma est" (frag. *Ann.* 501, ed. Vahlen).

may have justified the claim; but at so early a date such association with the great empires of the East was most flattering to Rome and implied high confidence that a glorious destiny awaited this fifth empire. But flattering as this theory regarding the succession of empires undoubtedly was, it is surprising to find mention of it in Rome, whose intellectual horizon could at this time scarcely include remote Assyria. Why should a Roman writer deliberately look to the ancient East for the historical background of the Roman Empire that was just emerging from Zama and Magnesia? Surely this succession of empires was suggested to him by a foreigner and accepted by Sura because of its emotional appeal.

The question thus arises as to where Sura got his list. In this bright dawn of their imperialism, many Romans looked to Greece for intellectual leadership; but we shall presently see that the views implied in this sketch of world-history were not then current among the Greeks, to whom they would have meant little. The list was equally un-Egyptian. The four monarchies were Asiatic, and the list was therefore probably of Asiatic origin. At this early period the Romans had little or no connection with Syria or Palestine,⁹ but they were in contact with many parts of Asia Minor. We may therefore suggest that the theory of four monarchies and a fifth was brought to Rome from Asia Minor. Perhaps the list was picked up by a Roman who participated in the Magnesia campaign under Scipio. We shall presently see that there is strong ground for suspecting that the underlying idea was then being propagated in the immediate vicinity of the battlefield. Or perhaps the list was brought to Rome by someone—even a Greek—from Asia Minor who wished to flatter the Romans: we think at once of the smooth-tongued Pergamene and Rhodian envoys who, according to Polybius,¹⁰ filled Rome with their propaganda at the time of the peace negotiations.

It must be added, however, that this history, tracing the course of empire from Assyria through the Medes and Persians to Macedonia

⁹ The fact that Sura wrote before the Third Macedonian War (171) rules out the possibility that the idea of four monarchies and a fifth was brought to Rome by the ambassadors of Judas Maccabaeus in 162 (*I Macc.*, chap. 8); moreover, these ambassadors would never have identified the fifth monarchy with Rome.

¹⁰ Polyb. xxi. 18-24; Livy xxxvii. 52-56.

and Rome, was too foreign and too exotic to make a deep impression upon the Roman thought of the day. Moreover, a fundamental change quickly came over Rome's educated classes which made this oriental theory even less acceptable to them than before. During the latter part of the third century and the first two decades of the second, Roman intellectuals had adopted a rather subservient attitude toward Greece and had done what they could to import Greek culture into Italy. During the 170's, however, this attitude changed, and Romans began to resent Greek pretensions to a monopoly on culture. Historians of the older generation, men such as Fabius Pictor, had learned what they could from Greece, had attempted to justify Roman conduct in Greek eyes, and often they even wrote in Greek; but writers belonging to the new generation, whose most conspicuous spokesman and historian was Cato the Censor, adopted the opposite attitude, sought to make their works very Roman, and expressed scorn for the Greeks and the "Greeklings" who aped them.¹¹ Sura clearly belonged to the elder generation—which is valuable supplementary evidence for the fact that he wrote before 171 B.C.—and learned what he could from Greeks and Orientals regarding both chronology and history; but the new generation had no sympathy with his views, and they did not perpetuate his conception of historical development. For more than a hundred years we hear nothing more in Rome about the four monarchies and a fifth; and, when the theory reappeared, its proponents usually criticized Roman imperialism rather than praising it. However, Sura's brief list establishes the fact that the philosophy of four empires and a fifth was known in Rome several years before the rise of Judas Maccabaeus and the composition of the Book of Daniel.

II

The succession of the Assyrian, Median, and Persian empires was quite familiar to the Greeks, for it had been described both by

¹¹ For the change which came over the character and spirit of Roman historical writing about 175 B.C. see M. Gelzer, "Römische Politik bei Fabius Pictor," *Hermes*, LXVIII (1933), 129-66, and "Der Anfang römischer Geschichtsschreibung," *ibid.*, LXIX (1934), 46-55; F. Klingner, "Römische Geschichtsschreibung bis zum Werke des Livius," *Die Antike*, XIII (1937), 1-19; for the intellectual revolution in general see F. Altheim, *Epochen der römischen Geschichte*, Vol. II (1935), Part III: "Veränderung der geistigen Richtung," of which pp. 305-13 deal with historiography.

Herodotus,¹² who wrote in the third quarter of the fifth century, and by Ctesias,¹³ who wrote in the first quarter of the fourth. Herodotus said little about the Assyrians, either in these passages or elsewhere, and he clearly considered them rather unimportant; he did not believe that either they or the Medes held a world-empire; and even to the Persians he did not attribute more than the overlordship of Asia until Cambyses conquered Egypt. He also devoted much attention to Egypt, which empire, it is important to note, does not appear in Sura's list. Ctesias wrote of these three Asiatic empires at greater length. According to his story, the first Assyrian king, Ninus, and his wife, Semiramis, held a true world-empire which extended from India to Egypt and the Aegean, and this empire was later taken over by the Medes and then by the Persians; his book was widely read, and his views formed the basis of the classical history of the ancient Orient throughout antiquity. Herodotus had been surprisingly accurate in his chronology of the Medes,¹⁴ but Ctesias' fantastic figures were taken over with slight modifications by later chronologists, notably by Castor,¹⁵ who passed them on to Africanus, Eusebius, and Jerome; they thus remained to plague Orientalists until the nineteenth century. Herodotus presumably derived his information on this matter from

¹² Herod. i. 95, 130.

¹³ Ctesias, epitomized in Diod. Sic. ii. 1-34.

¹⁴ Herodotus listed four Median kings who between them ruled 150 years, after which the last of them was conquered by Cyrus in 558. According to his chronology (i. 102, 106, 130), these kings were Deioeces (707-655), Phraortes (654-633), Cyaxares (632-593), and Astyages (592-558). Deioeces has been identified with Daiakku, "governor of the Mannai," mentioned by Sargon in 715 (A. T. Olmstead, *History of Assyria* [1923], p. 245); according to Herodotus, he was a prominent man before he began to rule, which makes plausible Sargon's reference to him eight years before he became king. Moreover, Herodotus' account says that Assyria was overthrown by the Medes and Babylonians in the days of Cyaxares, in which details it is likewise supported by modern research, which has shown that Cyaxares (Huvakhshatara) aided the Babylonians in their destruction of Nineveh in 612 (Olmstead, *op. cit.*, pp. 636 ff.). Ctesias, on the other hand, gave a list of nine Median kings, all different from those given by Herodotus, who ruled for a period of more than 282 years—perhaps 320 years—and the first of whom overthrew Assyria. This empire fell, therefore, about 880 B.C., while its history reached back 1,300 years to 2180 B.C. Certainty regarding these dates is not possible, for Ctesias' years for the last Median king are not given in Diodorus' fragment (ii. 32. 5-6; 34. 1; 34. 6); perhaps he was supposed to rule 38 years, as in other lists which seem to be derived from Ctesias. In another passage Ctesias said that Assyria was founded 1,000 years before the fall of Troy; the year 2180 was close enough to be associated with Eratosthenes' date 1184, and the chronology mentioned above, based on the year 2184, was thus worked out.

¹⁵ See Schwartz, *op. cit.*, pp. 8, 19, 94.

good Persian sources during his travels,¹⁶ while the uncritical Ctesias merely passed on the popular history, legends, and myths current in the Persian empire of his day: he had been court physician to Artaxerxes II for several years. At any rate, the succession Assyria—Media—Persia certainly was a Persian view of things: Babylonians would have said Assyria—Chaldea—Persia, and Egyptians would have had still another sequence; but the Persians themselves naturally looked back to their kinsmen the Medes, rather than to the Chaldeans or others, as their predecessors, and they believed that Assyria was conquered by these Medes rather than primarily by the Chaldeans as modern historians say. Herodotus' wide view of the world enabled him to put this succession in its place as a phase of local history; but Ctesias, repeating what he had heard at the Persian court, magnified it into world-history and attributed to the whole line of rulers from Ninus to his own day a reality of world-power equal to the pretensions of his employer, the King of Kings.

When Alexander overthrew the Persian empire, it was easy to add a fourth name to this list of world-empires; but the tradition of four empires took root only in the Asiatic or Seleucid part of Alexander's kingdom. Persian influence had never been deep in Egypt, and popular history continued to go back to the old days of the Pharaohs: neither Alexander nor his successors claimed to rule Egypt as successors of the Persians, but set themselves up as a new dynasty of Egyptian rulers. In Greece, likewise, historical memories remained what they had been and ran back to the Trojan War. But in Asia Alexander and his successors claimed to rule as heirs of Darius III. It thus came about that in Egypt and Greece we find no reference to the four world-empires of Assyrians, Medes, Persians, and Greeks: such a succession would have been meaningless, for it provided no important place for ancient Egypt or pre-Alexandrian Greece. If erudite scholars occasionally spoke of the succession of the first three, they spoke in the spirit of Herodotus rather than in that of Ctesias. In Asia, however, the idea of four empires took hold of the popular mind, and, as we have seen, it was given literary expression in the second century B.C.

¹⁶ Jacoby considers it "höchst wahrscheinlich" that Herodotus took his figures from the *Persica* of Dionysius (P.-W., s.v. "Herodotos," Supplementbd. II, col. 423, ll. 63 f.) but he offers no evidence. Even if this conjecture is correct, the figures came ultimately from a good Persian source.

But there is no evidence that the Seleucids or their supporters ever traced their power back to Ninus: when the theory was used, it took on a new form and was used against the Greeks. The origin of this change requires explanation.

Though Alexander and his successors tried to unite Greeks and Orientals into one people, their efforts were not very successful. Toward the middle of the third century the Orient began to rise against Hellenism, and eventually this revolt brought the Seleucids to ruin. The Parthians established their independence about 247. Antiochus III (223-187) was constantly troubled with revolts in various parts of his kingdom, which were often led by Greek generals exploiting native unrest, as in the cases of Molon in Media and Achaeus in Asia Minor. The latter rebel had married a daughter of Mithradates of Cappadocia, who was descended from the old Persian nobility; "at the suggestion of the populace" (*τῆς τῶν ὀχλῶν ὁρμῆς*), he assumed the crown in Lydia about 220, fought against and plundered the Greek cities, and with the aid of oriental troops and generals became the most powerful and formidable man west of the Taurus until he was finally captured and executed at Sardis in 213.¹⁷ After Antiochus' defeat at Magnesia confusion became general, and he was murdered by a mob at Elymais. His son, Seleucus IV, was murdered by his oriental prime minister Heliodorus in 175. Antiochus IV, his successor, suffered the revolt of Judas Maccabaeus, and when he died suddenly in 163 it was rumored among Jews and Gentiles that he had been struck down by the hand of God¹⁸—a sure sign of the feeling against him. Were the history of this troubled time from 250 to 150 better known, we would undoubtedly learn the names of many little Judases—many of them long before the great Judas—who arose in different parts of the vast Seleucid empire. Recent studies have brought to light many interesting examples of the propaganda spread during these various revolts.¹⁹ From the time of Molon we have apocalyptic writings, liver omens, prophecies, and paeans of victory. These bits of propaganda suggest an explanation of the apocalyptic element which now appeared in the

¹⁷ Polyb. iv. 48. 10 for the quotation; for his other exploits see index *s.v.*

¹⁸ II Mace. 9:5; Polyb. xxxi. 9.

¹⁹ A. T. Olmstead, "Intertestamental Studies," *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, LVI (1936), 242-57.

theory of the four empires. The three empires of the old story had been oriental; they had been cited to glorify the oriental Persian kings; and the oriental peoples associated this succession with their former kings. But the rulers of the fourth empire were foreigners: the Orientals then began to look forward to a fifth empire from which the Greeks would be expelled, and under which the old oriental system would return. It is perhaps not too much to suggest that, even in the days of Antiochus III, the Daniels of these other Judases sometimes spoke of four empires to be followed by a fifth that would be universal and eternal under the hand of God. This supposition would at least account for the virtually contemporary appearance of the theory in places so widely separated within the empire as Palestine and Asia Minor.

The fact that these revolts started in Bactria and Parthia and gradually advanced westward lends further plausibility to the suggestion that the theory of the four monarchies was itself of Persian origin: the theory advanced with the revolts. A Persian origin of the theory was conjectured a few years ago by Eduard Meyer on the basis of rather striking verbal similarities between the description of the colossus in Daniel and passages in certain Parsee works, written down in early Mohammedan times but composed much earlier, describing four world-ages characterized, respectively, by gold, silver, steel, and iron mixed with clay.²⁰ These passages tend to confirm the views at which we have arrived by a very different route.

²⁰ E. Meyer, *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums*, II (1921), 189 ff. The Parsee passages are in the Bahman-yasti and the Dinkard ix. 8 (trans. West, in *Sacred Books of the East*, V, 191, and XXXVII, 180). W. Bousset likewise believes that these verbal resemblances establish a connection between Daniel and Persian thought on this matter; but he thinks it highly probable that the idea of four ages, each characterized by one of these four metals, came to each from Babylon. He does not present his evidence (*Die Religion des Judentums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter* [3d ed., 1926], p. 508 n.).

If verbal similarities are to be taken as indicating common origin, the elucidation of Daniel should also require attention to Hesiod's four ages, each characterized by one of the metals of the colossus (*Erga* 106-201). It is not easy to connect these two stories. As such stories could not have been invented until iron was widely used—which was only a little before Hesiod's time—there could not have been an opportunity for the legend to travel far. Eduard Meyer has strongly defended the thesis that Hesiod personally invented his version of four—or five—ages ("Hesiods *Erga* und das Gedicht von den fünf Menschengeschlechtern," *Kleine Schriften*, II [1924], 15-66). The few similarities of the Greek and oriental stories are purely coincidental. Hesiod's ages were of course taken over by many ancient writers, especially the poets, but there seems to be no connection between his ideas and those of the historians to be mentioned below.

The author of the Book of Daniel therefore cannot be regarded as the inventor of the philosophy of history inherent in his interpretation of the dream and the vision, and perhaps this earlier history of the theory of four empires and a fifth may help clear up difficulties which have often perplexed commentators upon the book. While Daniel's first empire was clearly the Chaldean or Neo-Babylonian, and his second the Median, these two empires were in fact largely contemporaneous, one in the south and the other in the north; the Median, moreover, was much older than the Chaldean and was destroyed somewhat before it—both according to modern scientific chronology and also according to the quite different chronology that was current in the Hellenistic world. Then why did Daniel put the Medes in the second place? Also, the Persians succeeded immediately upon the Chaldeans in Babylon, where Daniel was supposed to live and prophesy, and where the Medes never ruled. These difficulties vanish when we recall that originally the first empire was not the Chaldean but the Assyrian. The author of Daniel, or his source, changed the original sequence—presumably in order to associate the first empire with the legendary Daniel of Babylon and with the Jewish tribulations during the Exile. This author was deeply ignorant of the history of the sixth century—which ignorance is illustrated notably by his references to the nonexistent “Darius the Mede”—and he therefore did not realize how much he confused his story by altering Assyria to Chaldea and by making it seem to emanate from Babylon. Moreover, many scholars are now of the opinion that other stories in the Book of Daniel—such as those of the fiery furnace and the lions' den—were of considerable antiquity and were adapted by the Maccabaeen writer to fit his purposes. Recent critics have also suggested that the present book is a highly composite work, and that even the two visions in chapters 2 and 7, setting forth the theory of the four empires, come from different hands. We need not discuss here the arguments favoring a composite authorship or attempt to settle the matter; but we may remark that such a thesis is quite plausible in view of our demonstration that the essential idea of the prophecies—an eternal fifth empire to follow the impending destruction of the fourth—was widely current in the Seleucid empire long before the composition of the Book of Daniel.

It is also possible to be somewhat more specific as to how this oriental theory of four monarchies reached Asia Minor. In the early days of the empire Cyrus and Darius established Persian colonists, called *Μαγουσαῖοι* by the Greeks, in various parts of their domain.²¹ The Persians thus settled in Asia Minor retained their identity far into the Christian Era, as is shown by references in Strabo and Basil.²² These *magusaioi* included Persian aristocrats, who at the beginning of the first century B.C. provided Mithradates with many of his officers, and also priests from whom Pompey's soldiers first learned to worship Mithra. Inscriptions show that their language was Aramaic²³—the language used to record the dream of the colossus in Daniel. In post-Alexandrian times these Persian aristocrats and priests supported the anti-Greek dynasties of Pontus, Armenia, Cappadocia, and Commagene, and we may be sure that they took part in the agitation against Antiochus III in the days of Achaeus. It is likewise very probable that their propaganda resembled that in the rest of the Aramaic-speaking world, where the theory of four monarchies was current. These *magusaioi* were most numerous in Cappadocia and Pontus, but they extended as far west as Galatia and Phrygia, and there were some even in Lydia. Magnesia itself lay in the "Hyrcanian plain,"²⁴ so called because it had been colonized by settlers sent from Hyrcania in Persia. Artaxerxes III built a temple to a Persian goddess at Sardis in Lydia,²⁵ which was only thirty-five miles from Magnesia. And at Hierakome—later called Hierocaesarea—there was a temple to the "Persian Artemis" built by Cyrus;²⁶ this temple was less than twenty miles from Magnesia. Scipio undoubtedly passed through

²¹ For accounts of these Persian colonies see esp. F. Cumont, *Textes et monuments figurés relatifs aux mystères de Mithra* (1899), I, 9–11, 231–34; and *Les Religions orientales dans le paganisme romain* (4 ed., 1929), pp. 218, 225–29.

²² Strab. xv. 3. 15; cf. xi. 8. 4; xi. 14. 16; Basil *Epist.* 258, at end; Euseb. *Praep. evan.* vi. 10 (Migne, *PG*, XXI, 468B, 473C, quoting the Syriac Bardesanes).

²³ Cumont, *Les Religions orientales*, p. 228.

²⁴ Livy xxxvii. 38. This plain was also called the "plain of Cyrus" (W. M. Ramsay, *Historical Geography of Asia Minor* [1890], p. 124).

²⁵ Berosus, frag. 6; Müller, *F.H.G.*, II, 509.

²⁶ Tacit. *Ann.* iii. 62. According to Pausanias (v. 27. 5) the Persian goddess was still worshiped there in the second century A.D.; in the first century B.C. the city issued coins showing a bust of Artemis with the word *Περσική* underneath; see Büchner, in P.-W., s.v. "Hierakome."

Hiera Kome when advancing against Antiochus, and he had it only a few miles behind his lines during the battle.²⁷

The Roman soldiers at Magnesia therefore found themselves in the heart of one of these Persian colonies, whose inhabitants had no love for their Greek rulers; in this particular locality, moreover, hatred of the Greeks was presumably intensified by the fact that only eleven years before, in 201, the whole countryside had been plundered by Antiochus' Macedonian ally, Philip V.²⁸ It would not be surprising, therefore, if in 190 Persian priests of the temple at Hiera Kome had proclaimed the immediate appearance of the fifth monarchy, prophesying in their excitement at learning of the overthrow of the hated Antiochus III. Romans in the vicinity may well have heard something of these excited remarks and thus have learned and applied to themselves the theory of history soon to be set forth by Sura. On the other hand, Hiera Kome is less than fifty miles from Pergamum, whose Greek rulers undoubtedly knew something of what was being said there long before the battle and after it. But, if it still seems hazardous to conclude that this temple was the center from which the prophecy spread to the West, we can remember that there were other Persian colonies in Lydia and western Asia Minor through which the theory of four monarchies and a fifth may have come to Rome.

III

The isolationist policies of Cato and his friends were quite unable to prevent the spread of Greek culture to Italy, but they turned Roman historiography into new channels. For more than a hundred years after Cato's time, Roman writers of history concerned themselves almost exclusively with Roman or Italian matters, paying little attention to Greece and none at all to the Orient. This tendency was encouraged by the political developments of the day, for, except during the Third Punic and Fourth Macedonian wars (149-146), the

²⁷ Hiera Kome is on the main road between Thyatira and Magnesia, which also connects Pergamum with Sardis. According to Livy (xxxvii. 37), Antiochus first established his headquarters at Thyatira and then withdrew to Magnesia, with Scipio following him. The temple was therefore fifteen or twenty miles behind the Roman lines during the battle (see H. Kiepert, *Formae orbis antiqui*, No. VII, "Asia Minor" [1908]).

²⁸ Polyb. xvi. 1. 7-8.

attention of Roman leaders was directed primarily to domestic affairs, and there was little aggressive demand for new annexations of territory. But the wars of Sulla, Lucullus, and Pompey against Mithradates during the first half of the next century turned attention to the East once more, and educated people wished to know more about these remote countries. After the time of Sulla Greek historians began to write more fully about the Orient, and their works were intended primarily for Roman readers. Among these writers may be mentioned such historians as Alexander Polyhistor (*ca.* 70 B.C.), Diodorus Siculus (*ca.* 40 B.C.), Nicolas of Damascus (*ca.* 4 B.C.), and the chronologist Castor of Rhodes (*ca.* 60 B.C.), all of whom were friendly to Rome, but who wrote world-histories in which the Orient and Greece played the predominant parts. Latin writers still persisted in the old patriotic groove, but in the days of Augustus there must have been many people even in Rome to whom Livy's story—telling how the inhabitants of a village on the Tiber went out and conquered the world—seemed rather parochial and who knew that there was much history that could not be found in any of his 142 volumes. The monarchies of the ancient East lay far beyond Cato's intellectual horizon, but a hundred and fifty years later their names and something of their history were well known in Rome. The theory of the four monarchies then reappeared, and Rome was again hailed as the fifth monarchy. In discussing these new writers, we must bear in mind that the theory of four monarchies and a fifth included three elements: (1) it made each monarchy a world-empire; (2) it minimized everything else (e.g., pre-Alexandrian Greece and ancient Egypt); and (3) it declared that the fifth monarchy—which might or might not have appeared as yet—would be vastly superior to all its predecessors and last forever.

In the Introduction to his *Roman Antiquities*²⁹ Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*ca.* 10 B.C.) showed an acquaintance with the theory. He listed the four great empires of Assyria, Media, Persia, and Macedonia in turn and praised Rome, the fifth empire, at their expense; and, though he denied that any of the four was a true world-empire, he did so merely to exalt the fifth empire. This passage is, however, only one out of many praising Rome from various points of view, and

²⁹ Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* i. 2. 2-4.

the author did not return again to the theory of four empires; in the body of his history he went back in good Greek style to the Trojan War. Likewise Appian, in his *Roman History*,³⁰ (ca. 140 A.D.) referred to Rome as a fifth empire, following upon those of the Assyrians, the Medes, the Persians, and the Macedonians; and he then praised the fifth empire in the usual way. He clearly knew of the theory of the four empires and a fifth, but he did not pay much attention to it. The full import of the theory remained known to pagans down to the very end of the ancient world, however, for Claudian, sometimes called the last Roman poet (ca. 400 A.D.), eulogized Rome as the fifth empire, universal and eternal.³¹

The theory also found its way into some of the lesser chronologies. We have seen that, soon after its first appearance in the West, chronographers began associating the fall of Assyria with the founding of Rome, as shown by Ennius. They now endeavored to attach each of four empires to a crucial date: thus the fall of Assyria, the rise of Media, the origin of the Macedonian dynasty, and the founding of Carthage were sometimes dated in one and the same year, with Rome coming later as a fifth empire.³² Or sometimes the foundation of Rome was put in the same year as the fall of Assyria, as had apparently been done by Ennius, in order to connect the first and last empires in the series. This connection appears in Latin literature even as late as Augustine, who, probably following Varro, introduced it into his *City of God*.³³

While Pompey destroyed the armed forces of the Orient, he did not win the hearts of the Orientals. As they could no longer fight against Rome with armies, they returned to the old method of propa-

³⁰ App. *Praef.* 9.

³¹ Claudian *De consulatu Stilichonis* iii. 159-66: "Nor will there ever be a limit to the empire of Rome, for luxury and its attendant vices, with pride and sequent hate, have brought to ruin all kingdoms else. . . . Thus the Mede deprived the Assyrian of empire, and the Persian the Mede. Macedonia subdued Persia and was herself to yield to Rome" (trans. Platnauer).

³² Many interesting examples of these practices are mentioned by C. Trieber, "Die Idee der vier Weltreiche," *Hermes*, XXVII (1892), 321-44. This article deals entirely with such chronologies: some of Trieber's statements are strongly criticized by Schwartz (*op. cit.*), and some of Schwartz's are contradicted by Jacoby (P.-W., s.v. "Ktesias").

³³ Aug. *De civ. Dei* xviii. 27: "quando regnum defecit Assyrium, coepitque Romanum" (cf. xviii. 2; 22, etc.).

ganda which they had used against the Seleucids long before.³⁴ "L'Asie, vaincue par les armes étrangères, continua à lutter pour la suprématie à coups d'oracles."³⁵ Beginning with the second half of the first century B.C. the Orient produced a large number of prophecies against Rome: a celebrated example was the "Oracle of Hystaspes," dating from the early years of the first century A.D., which was full of Persian ideas and which, three centuries later, was incorporated by the Christian Lactantius in his *Divine Institutions*.³⁶ This prophecy, and many others, foretold the impending doom of Rome and the revenge of the Orient: a new king would arise out of the East who would punish Rome for her oppression and rule in her place.³⁷

Among the Orientals who thus prophesied against Rome the Jews took a prominent part, just as they were the most vigorous in their armed opposition to Rome. Palestine was full of zealots, messianic enthusiasts, and prophets.³⁸ Such writings as the *Sybilline Oracles* are full of anti-Roman prophecies, for, though some of these books were written in the second century B.C., they received extensive interpolations at a later date; the *Psalms of Solomon* (ca. 45 B.C.) and the *Assumption of Moses* (A.D. 7-30) show bitter hatred of Rome; and many of the anti-Roman statements in the Apocalypse go back to Jewish sources and reflect ideas that were then widely current in the East.³⁹ Among these prophecies the theory of the four monarchies and a fifth reappears, but in a slightly altered form, making Rome the

³⁴ For a general account of this anti-Roman propaganda see H. Fuchs, *Der geistige Widerstand gegen Rom in der antiken Welt* (Berlin, 1938).

³⁵ F. Cumont, "La Fin du monde selon les mages occidentaux," *Revue de l'histoire des religions*, CIII (1931), 72.

³⁶ Cumont, "La Fin du monde," pp. 64-93; Lact. *Div. Inst.* vii. 15 ff.; also references in Justin *Apol.* i. 20. 1 and 44. 12. Unfortunately, I have been unable to see the important work of H. Windisch, "Die Orakel des Hystaspes," in the *Verhandelingen* of the Amsterdam Academy, Vol. XXVIII, No. 3 (1929).

³⁷ "Romanum nomen quo nunc regitur orbis—horret animus dicere, sed dicam, quia futurum est—tollitur e terra et imperium in Asiam reuertetur ac rursus oriens dominabitur atque occidens seruiet" (Lact. *Div. Inst.* vii. 15. 11 [ed. Brandt]). For references to the king from the East see Fuchs, *op. cit.*, pp. 31-35, n. 19; Cumont, "La Fin du monde," p. 72, referring to Windisch, *op. cit.*, pp. 52 ff.

³⁸ Jos. *Ant. Jud.* xvii. 6. 3; 9. 2; 10. 1-10; xviii. 1. 6; 3. 1-2; 4. 1; xx. 5. 1-3; 8. 5; *et passim*.

³⁹ Rev. 16:12, for kings from the East; perhaps there is a dim reflection of this idea in Matt. 24:27, where it seems to be implied that the Son of Man will appear in the East; in the corresponding passage in Luke (17:24) the words ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν do not occur.

fourth monarchy and predicting a new fifth monarchy from the Orient.⁴⁰ These writers did not bother to identify the first three monarchies, thus showing that the idea of four monarchies had become traditional and that the fourth alone was considered important. The Jews of course took the theory from the Book of Daniel; but, as we also find it mentioned by others who knew little or nothing of the Jews or their writings, we may assume that the theory of four monarchies and a fifth was also revived by other Orientals at this time.

These various oriental prophecies were not unknown to the Romans, and during the last days of the Civil War discouraged persons at Rome took them quite seriously. Quotations from them may be found in such writers as Horace and Sallust, and Augustus once ordered the burning of more than two thousand books of this sort.⁴¹ And one important historian of this time, Pompeius Trogus, who had no love for Roman imperialism, made the theory of four monarchies the basis of his work: he had learned the theory not from Jews⁴² but from Orientals.

Pompeius Trogus was the most important pagan writer to make Rome the fourth empire, and he was the chief historian writing under the early Empire from the opposition point of view. His *Philippic History*, written in forty-four books in the days of Augustus, is now known to us only through brief summaries of each book (*prologi*) and a rather full but capricious epitome made by M. Junius Justinus, probably toward the end of the third century. Trogus' grandfather had been a native of Narbonese Gaul to whom Pompey granted Roman citizenship, and his father had fought in Caesar's army, but regarding the historian himself we have no information. His whole work was organized around four successive empires: it opened with a

⁴⁰ II Bar. 39:3-7; IV Ezra 12:11-12; in the latter passage an eagle (Rome) is explained as symbolical of Daniel's fourth monarchy, "but it was not interpreted unto him as I now expound it unto thee." Josephus, writing about A.D. 90, clearly regarded the theory of the four monarchies as anti-Roman, though he was not anti-Roman himself: "Daniel also revealed to the king the meaning of the stone, but I have not thought it proper to relate this" (*Ant. Jud.* x. 10. 4). And writers in the Talmud, some of them writing in Roman times, often make Rome the fourth empire when interpreting Daniel (see Rowley, *op. cit.*, p. 75, n. 12).

⁴¹ Suet. *Aug.* 31; cf. Hor. *Epod.* 16; Sall. *Or. ad Caes.* v. 2; Fuchs, *op. cit.*, pp. 37-38, n. 27.

⁴² His ignorance of everything Jewish is well shown in his absurd sketch of their history (xxxvi. 2-3) which is drawn from anti-Semitic writers.

brief summary of the legendary history of Assyria; after this came a fuller account of Persia,⁴³ with Greece as a subdivision; Philip of Macedon appeared in Book vii, and his successors occupied the remainder of the work until the Romans were introduced almost at the end. Trogus showed himself to be distinctly anti-Roman, speaking often of Rome's aggressiveness⁴⁴ and keeping her in the background as much as possible: only in Book xliii did he give a cursory sketch of Roman origins, in which he emphasized her early lawlessness, and he followed this immediately with an equally full account of the origins of Marseilles, stressing her civilizing influence. He devoted two whole books to praise of the Parthians, two more to a eulogy of Rome's archenemy Mithradates, and he was very kind to Hannibal. This anti-Roman bias may have been due in part to Trogus' Gallic ancestry, or to unfortunate experiences in Rome; but he learned his history from Greeks⁴⁵ or Greek-speaking Orientals: he put forward the historical views of Rome's eastern critics. But he had no love for the Persians or Macedonians either: he was primarily an anti-imperialist, and his sympathies went to those who fought against the great empires, to the Greeks at Marathon and later to Mithradates and the Parthians. Though he discussed a multitude of peoples in his book, he arranged them around the four great empires; and, like the other historians of the four empires, he devoted little attention to the Egyptians before Alexander, regarding them as barbarians comparable to the Scyths, outside the main stream of history.⁴⁶ Trogus' history

⁴³ Justin's treatment of the Medes is interesting. They are used only to bridge the chronological gap between the Assyrians and the Persians, and concerning them he merely repeats, confusedly and incorrectly, Herodotus' stories about the fall of Nineveh and the origins of Cyrus. Because of their romantic interest he gives these stories in some detail: they fill four and a half pages of his epitome while only a little over two pages are devoted to Assyria. This allotment of space is quite characteristic of Justin—who described his work as a "little bouquet of flowers" (*florum corpusculum* [Praef. 4])—but it does not represent Trogus at all. His account of the Assyrians probably contained many historical (or pseudo-historical) facts which Justin could easily abbreviate or omit; but the account of the Medes probably was shortened very little if at all. Trogus certainly did not believe that the Medes held a world-empire.

⁴⁴ For examples of this aggressiveness see Justin xxix. 2; xxx. 3, 4; xxxiv. 1, 3; xxxix. 5; xl. 2; xlv. 2, 5; see also the speech of the Aetolians (xxviii. 2) and especially the long speech put into the mouth of Mithradates (xxxviii. 4–7), which Justin considered so important that he copied it out in full.

⁴⁵ Perhaps from some of those *levissimi ex Graecis* whom Livy reproached (ix. 18. 6) for praising Parthians at the expense of Romans.

⁴⁶ Just. i. 1, 9; ii. 1.

showed that Assyria, Persia, Macedonia, and Rome had each ruled in terrible fashion, and the implication followed that a new empire would do better: perhaps the Parthians would provide the oriental king whose coming the prophets had so often foretold. Trogus was rarely mentioned by his pagan successors—perhaps because of his defective Roman patriotism—but, before Justin composed the epitome, the situation had changed: after the days of the Severi there were many persons, even in the Latin West, who were rather glad to see the orthodox history of Rome exploded and who gave Justin's epitome respectful attention. We shall see that the Christians made great use of it.

IV

The early Christians were of course the most determined opponents of the Roman Empire, and eventually they gathered into their system nearly all the criticisms of that empire that were current at the time. They too wrote about a fourth empire which they identified with Rome. They had taken the idea in the first place from Daniel—of which book the pagans seem never to have heard—and they laid great emphasis upon the fifth empire, which they sometimes associated with the apocalyptic Second Coming and the resurrection, but which they sometimes identified with their church on earth.⁴⁷ It is worthy of note, however, that these earliest Christians did not try to hang world-history around the four empires as the pagans did. Thus Hippolytus, who died in 235, identified the first kingdom with the Babylonians, the second with the Medes and Persians (or the Persians alone), the third with the Greeks, and the fourth with Rome, both in his *Antichrist* and in his *Commentary on Daniel*, but there is no trace of the theory in his *Chronicle*. Likewise, when his contemporary Julius Africanus prepared his *Chronicle*, he drew heavily from Castor and other pagans, and he devoted great attention to showing that Daniel's prophecies of weeks and days had been fulfilled in detail⁴⁸ (permanently falsifying Christian chronology in so doing), but he did not introduce the four empires into his scheme of things. Eusebius, writing nearly a century later, was of course much indebted to Afri-

⁴⁷ Barnabas iv. 5; Irenaeus *Cont. Haer.* v. 26. 1; Hippolytus *De antichr.* 19–28; *Comm. in Dan.* ii. 12; Origen *Comm. in Gen.* iii. 4.

⁴⁸ Schwartz, *op. cit.*, pp. 25–38.

canus and took from him the fulfilment of the seventy weeks; but the four empires do not appear either in the *Chronicle* or in the *Ecclesiastical History*. In his *Demonstratio evangelica*,⁴⁹ however, Eusebius discussed Daniel at length, identifying the four empires with Assyria, Persia, Macedonia, and Rome. This substitution of Assyria for the biblical Chaldea, and the omission of the Medes both in Eusebius and in Hippolytus' *Commentary*, are most significant, for they indicate the influence of pagan writers about the four monarchies.

The introduction of the theory of four empires and a fifth into Christian historiography was due primarily to Jerome. When translating Eusebius' *Chronicle* (or rather, the canon, the second half of it, which contained the chronological tables) into Latin, he added much new material for the period after the Trojan War and rearranged the old material to make it fit the philosophy of four empires. In his translation, as in Eusebius' original text, the canon showed the years of the rulers of each country arranged in columns; in each edition the years from the birth of Abraham came in the first main column, but Jerome rearranged the others in such a way that the four empires succeeded one another in the second column, with the Assyrians, Persians, Greeks, and Romans coming in turn; the lesser peoples were arranged around this guide, as in Trogus.

Like his predecessor Trogus, Jerome had trouble with the Medes, whom he did not consider one of the four world-empires. Eusebius, as we have seen, did not make the theory of four empires a part of his *Chronicle*, and in the canon he left a period of 111 years after the fall of Assyria in which the four were unrepresented: in the introductory half of his work he named eight Median kings (a queer combination of names, probably taken over from Africanus, the first four of which came ultimately from Ctesias, the last four from Herodotus), but in the canon only the last four (Deioces to Astyages) were listed. Jerome put the entire list in the canon, in order to have his guiding column complete, and called Arbaces the first king of the Medes, Deioces the fifth.⁵⁰ Immediately beside the statement about Arbaces,

⁴⁹ Euseb. *Demon. evan.* xv. frag. 1 (ed. Heikel, p. 494).

⁵⁰ Euseb. *Chron.* (ed. Schoene, I, 67), for the eight kings; cf. Canon, *Ann. Abr.* 1309 (versio Armenia, which was translated directly from Eusebius' Greek text): "Primus imperavit Dioces a. LIV"; (Hieron.) "Medor. V Deioces a. LIII" (Schoene, II, 84).

however, stands an important note saying that until Deioeces things went on without princes, that in the midst of this period the Chaldeans established a separate succession of kings, and that the other peoples had their own kings. We cannot say whether Eusebius or Jerome wrote this note,⁵¹ but it is equally significant whether Jerome wrote it or merely allowed it to stand when changing the rest. He was obviously anxious to exclude the Medes from the list and thus have only four world-empires with Rome as the last. In his *Commentary on Daniel*, on the other hand, Jerome identified the first empire with Babylonia, the second with the Medes and Persians taken as one. His history was therefore independent of his exegesis. In the Prologue to the *Commentary* he confesses explicitly that he was much indebted to Trogus and Justin.⁵² While he wrote the *Commentary* about 407, many years after translating the *Chronicle* (ca. 380), it does not seem likely that a scholar of Jerome's attainments should learn of Trogus only in his old age, especially as he shared the earlier writer's views in his historical writing but not in his later work. It is more than likely, therefore, that the idea of arranging world-history according to the scheme of four empires came to Jerome from this pagan historian who had used it more than four centuries before him.

A few years later (ca. 418) Orosius wrote his celebrated *Seven Books of Histories against the Pagans*, which work is based upon the theory of four empires and a fifth. In two separate passages⁵³ Orosius set forth his views on the subject of the four empires at length, and he so arranged the whole work that the sequence of empires provided its backbone: Book i deals with Assyria, Books ii-iii with Macedonia,

⁵¹ The Armenian translation, usually a guide to what Jerome added, is unfortunately missing at this point. The quotation from Syncellus which Schoene put on the margin of this page proves nothing about Eusebius' text here. The note appears at *Ann. Abr.* 1198 (Schoene, II, 75).

⁵² The *Commentary* is full of polemics against Porphyry, who had interpreted Daniel in a strikingly modern manner. When setting forth his own qualifications, Jerome declared that he had studied not only the long list of Greek authors upon whom Porphyry claimed to rely but also Josephus "praecipueque nostri Livii et Pompeii Trogi, atque Iustini . . ." (*Comm. in Dan. Proph.*, prol. [Migne, *PL*, XXV, 494B]). For the identifications with Babylonia see his comments on Dan. 2:38 and 7:4 (Migne, *PL*, XXV, 503 and 528). In the latter passage he once seems to confuse the Babylonian empire with the Assyrian; this was presumably a slip, for in the *Chronicle* and elsewhere he clearly distinguished the two.

⁵³ Oros. ii. 1. 4-6; vii. 2. 1-16.

Book iv with Carthage, Books v-vi with Rome, and in Book vii, which begins with the birth of Christ, we watch the fifth empire gradually replace the fourth. Orosius nowhere associates this philosophy with Daniel—he does not even record the celebrated dream and vision—and, while he knew Jerome personally and used Justin as his principal source for secular history, his arrangement of the empires, including Carthage, indicates that he learned this philosophy of history elsewhere. Like the chronologists mentioned above, he makes Macedonia and Carthage contemporary, following immediately upon the fall of Assyria;⁵⁴ and, by omitting the Medes and Persians completely, he makes Rome the fourth empire rather than the fifth. He also remarks that Assyria was the true predecessor of Rome, with the other two acting as guardians during Rome's minority.⁵⁵ This view of the true succession, also expressed by Augustine,⁵⁶ lent new meaning to the identification of Rome with Babylon in the Apocalypse, but clearly it was of pagan rather than of Christian origin.

Thus the theory of the four empires and a fifth at last came into its own. The philosophy of history set forth by Jerome and Orosius was derived not from Daniel but from the pagans, some of whom had developed its essential features years before the Book of Daniel was written. For several centuries this philosophy of history had been held by opponents of Hellenistic and Roman imperialism, and, with the triumph of Christianity, these opposition theories of history triumphed too. For a thousand years thereafter Jerome, Orosius, and Justin were regarded in the West as standard guides to classical history. Trogus superseded Thucydides, Livy, and Tacitus, and his "new history" retained its supremacy in western Europe until scholars at the time of the Renaissance revived the official and orthodox views that had once been set forth by such writers as Livy.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

⁵⁴ Oros. vii. 2. 9.

⁵⁵ Oros. ii. 1. 6; vii. 2. 4.

⁵⁶ Oros. vii. 2. 5; Aug. *De civ. Dei*, xviii. 2, 22, 27 (cf. n. 33 above). Long ago Trieber suggested (*op. cit.*, p. 323) that Augustine got the idea that Rome was the second Babylon from pagan writers rather than from the Apocalypse. This seems very probable. Orosius undoubtedly learned the idea from Augustine, whom he addressed as "beatissime pater." The author of the Apocalypse was, of course, full of the ideas and imagery of Daniel and called Rome "Babylon the Great," but there is no reason to suppose that he was acquainted with the pagan critics of Rome who connected her with Babylon.

PROMETHEUS BOUND

DAVID GRENE

IN THE eighteenth century the critics knew what they thought about the *Prometheus* of Aeschylus and knew why they thought it. It was a bad play because the structure was episodic, the characters extravagant and improbable, the diction uncouth and wild.¹ Their handbook of criticism was the *Poetics* of Aristotle, either directly or indirectly drawn upon. And it is plain that the Aeschylean plan does not measure up to Aristotelian standards. Since the eighteenth-century critics believed that there was only one canon for drama rooted in the principles of Aristotle, they quite reasonably judged the *Prometheus* a bad play. During the nineteenth century, with the Romantic revival and the breakdown of the so-called "classical" rules of the drama, the *Prometheus* was acclaimed by the critics as a great work of art.² But they so acclaimed it entirely in terms of its theme or its poetry and in the same breath spoke of the greatness of Sophocles' *Oedipus*, Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, and Goethe's *Faust*. There was no effort to discover what was the nature of Aeschylus' dramatic method which set him so apart from Sophocles that the eighteenth-century critics had refused to recognize his merit. Nor did they sift the striking differences which exist between the *Prometheus* and any of the Shakespearean tragedies or *Faust*. They contented themselves with vague and not entirely satisfied references to the *Prometheus* as a study-drama rather than a play for the theater. Or they observed that the *Prometheus* was a magnificent tragedy but very static.

This article is an attempt to explain what I believe to be the dramatic design in the *Prometheus*—a design as clearly defined as that of Sophocles in the *Oedipus*. Other problems incidental to the consideration of the *Prometheus*, such as the position of our play in the trilogy

¹ See La Harpe, *Lycée*, Part I, Book I, chap. v, Sec. II (1821 ed.: I, 302-3); Fontenelle, *Remarques sur quelques comédies d'Aristophane, sur le théâtre grec, &c* (1766 ed.: IX, 448).

² See A. W. Schlegel, *Werke* (Leipzig: Weidmann, 1846), V, 108-10 (in *Vorlesungen über dramatische Kunst und Litteratur, Sechste Vorlesung*).

as a whole, and the probable nature of the conclusion, have been omitted from the discussion. I have only assumed that the final issue is some form of compromise between Zeus and Prometheus. This inference seems to be justified by the crucial lines in the extant play, 177-80 and 1027, and in general by the conclusion of the somewhat similar problem in the *Oresteia*, when the old gods and the new are at last reconciled.

In the case of the plays of both Sophocles and Euripides, plot and character are closely combined. The evolution of the plot is indicative of the character of the persons involved, and the character of these persons is the conditioning force of the plot. That is to say, while accidents arbitrarily occurring may force Oedipus into a position where no action is possible for him other than that which he takes, yet Oedipus' character is decisive as the determinant of the form of his speeches under stress of these circumstances and the violence of his reaction to this or that calamity. Oedipus is doomed to kill his father and marry his mother. But it is because he is a strong, resolute, and determined man that his reactions are what they are, and his speeches manifest what Aristotle calls moral preference (*proairesis*). So character and plot are bound up together, and the play is the evolution of a gradual *anagnorisis* of Oedipus. His naturally vigorous temper and his helpless ignorance are the conditioning forces of the plot. But action is its mainspring, for it is through action that we see the gradual changes in Oedipus. In this, as in all his plays, Sophocles aims to bring out the dramatic implications of a particular story. The myth is given life by the accurate reconstruction of the characters in terms of fifth-century Greek reality. Thus incidentally Sophocles deals with political, social, and moral problems inherent in his dramatic situations. But the problems come up naturally, as part of the story, and their solution has no authoritative voice. I do not think that anyone could give a satisfactory account of Sophocles' theology or of Sophocles' beliefs on the nature of the state or the relative validity of state law and moral law. True, such questions are raised in the seven extant plays; but they are raised, it would seem, because Sophocles' knowledge of men involved him in such problems when he dramatized the myth. He has no solutions. There is hardly even particular sympathy or the reverse in the wonderfully impartial weave of the drama. If the story is truly re-

ported, says the poet in effect, we must imagine the men and the situations involved to have been something like this.

In Euripides the interest is centered either in character or in the intellectual implications of the myth. By means of the Prologue and Epilogue he shortens and cuts the myth until its compass is the one short action which is to constitute the plot. Within this action, the author sometimes extends the part of some particular character and writes the play around it—as in the *Electra*, or in the *Hippolytus*, where he makes Phaedra the center of the play. Or else he will expand the thought implicit in some single situation far beyond the general design of the story. A good instance is the lengthy treatment of the entire democracy versus tyranny theme in the *Suppliants*.

In both these poets, action is all important. It is only through action carefully constructed that Sophocles can dramatize the myth and effect his intimate combination of plot and character. It is only by action that Euripides can bring out either his minute study of character or the particular moral, political, or religious argument he wishes to illustrate. In the case of both alike, the poet is bent on giving the myth an individual life of its own each time it is reincarnated in a play.

As distinct from Sophocles, or from Euripides in his psychological plays, Aeschylus is a great self-conscious teacher, one who has come to certain conclusions as to man's destiny and the divine government of the cosmos. As distinct from Euripides' interest in a solutionless presentation of intellectual problems, Aeschylus is concerned to give a positive theology which he conceives as having universal significance. So the myth is for him the illustration of a great permanent truth which he finds at the heart of man's activity. His dramatic imagination seizes on such truths as are most frequently a compromise between two opposites, and consequently the myths he uses most are those which tell of conflict on a cosmic scale and conflict ultimately laid by some concessions on the part of both combatants.³ To make

³ These generalizations on Aeschylus' dramatic method are not intended to be a complete statement. In their entirety they apply only, I think, to the *Prometheus*. The *Oresteia* is a curious combination of the kind of action-drama written by Sophocles and Euripides and the characteristically Aeschylean symbolic play. But hardly any of the plays of Aeschylus seem to me free of an allegorical meaning in which every dramatic symbol does duty twice or three times on different levels of significance.

the myth universally significant, both characters and plot must correspond symbolically with characters and plot on one or more levels in addition to the myth in which they are imbedded. On each of these levels there is character solidly developed. Each has a little drama of its own. But it is a drama which does not evolve through the medium of action within the piece. It is displayed through prolonged exposition in narrative, each stage of the exposition making an advance on the preceding in completeness. While it is possible to understand each level of the symbolism entirely in terms of itself, it is enormously enhanced in significance when all the others are taken into account. The story chosen is usually simple and uncomplicated, since it is nearly impossible to find a complicated story which can be significant on many levels at once.

The most striking difference, formally, between the Aeschylean drama and dramas subject to the Aristotelian criticism centers in their treatment of probability. Probability is the means whereby every dramatist induces that willing suspension of disbelief which is the prerequisite for the play. According to the Aristotelian criticism, probability is constructed almost entirely in terms of the play itself. That is to say, the probability of any incident in the play, of this or that trait which is important in the working-out of the character, must be solved in terms of the play itself. The dramatist may admit of many improbabilities in the situation assumed when the play opens; but, once it opens, the train of causation must be clear in terms of the given situation. Coincidences are justifiable in limited number and even some improbable coincidences because, as Agathon says (*Poetics* 1466a), it is probable that some improbable things may happen. It is plain, however, that there is over and above this a probability which has its roots in the common experience of humanity. Absolute shifts from extreme hostility to extreme friendliness tend to break the force of the drama. In fact, the probability of the action is rooted in the conditions stated by the dramatist at the beginning, but the probability of the character is almost altogether rooted in the common experience of man.

In the Aeschylean symbolic play, like *Prometheus*, the probability is not in the action or the conditions the dramatist has stated for us before the play commences. It consists in setting forth a very simple

story, one which comes from a common stock of mythological stories known to almost all, and fusing this with a number of other patterns known to almost all. Everybody in Greece knew the legend of the Titan who stole fire from heaven to give it to man. But everybody in Greece also knew the story of Hippias and Hipparchus, the tyrants of Athens, or Lygdamis the tyrant of Naxos, or Polycrates the tyrant of Samos. They knew the kind of outrage citizens had suffered at their hands, the innovations in established custom and ritual and in the conventional governmental attributes of mercy, the *ἀγραπτοὶ νόμοι*. So when the Prometheus-Zeus conflict is represented also as the rebel versus tyrant conflict, it has been invested with a new probability. And men everywhere have felt, some obscurely and some clearly, an opposition between the animal and the spirit in man, between violence and persuasion, between might and intellect. So when the Zeus-Lygdamis versus Prometheus-rebel struggle is represented as another facet of the conflict between the two most powerful factors in human life—brute force and mind—the story has been invested with a new probability drawn from the community of man's experience. And men everywhere have known the torture of subjugation to a stronger force than themselves, have known the helplessness of persuasion against force, and yet have believed in the ultimate triumph of persuasion. And so when the suffering Prometheus cries out in his helplessness and his knowledge, and doubts yet feels certain of the final outcome, the story has been invested with a new probability drawn from the community of man's experience. The original story of Zeus and Prometheus is like a stone thrown into a quiet pool, where the ripples spread in wider and wider circles.

Methods like the Aeschylean, developed to varying degrees of complexity, are familiar in other forms of literature. The degree of complexity is determined by the number of levels of meaning involved. For instance, in the *Pilgrim's Progress*, there is only one meaning in the tale apart from the highly dramatic story of Christian's journey, and that is the progress of the Christian soul toward the Eternal City. But in the *Prometheus*, Aeschylus has made his story significant on a number of different levels, though each level involves the conflict of two opposing principles. For Prometheus is, politically, the symbol of the rebel against the tyrant who has overthrown the traditional rule

of Justice and Law. He is the symbol of Knowledge against Force. He is symbolically the champion of man, raising him through the gift of intelligence, against the would-be destroyer of man. Finally there is a level at which Prometheus is symbolically Man as opposed to God.

If we look at each of these patterns singly, we can see it progressively clarified in the characters and the plot, interlacing with one another, until the dramatist, having indicated all the issues between the two opposites, presumably found some compromise at which they were reconciled. Naturally all the characters are not significant at all levels of the symbolism. That would be to demand of an artistic work the precision of a geometrical figure. But the central figure of Prometheus is significant at all levels, and on all levels the plot represents the strife between two opposing principles.

CHARACTER SYMBOLISM ON THE POLITICAL LEVEL

First the pattern of Prometheus the rebel against the tyrant.⁴ Hephaestus' relation toward Zeus in the first scene is a very pregnant piece of political allegory. He is selected to be the instrument of the tyrant's vengeance because it is Hephaestus' privilege which Prometheus has given to man. Consequently, it is he who should feel most poignantly indignation at the theft. This is indeed called to his attention by Might (l. 7). But Hephaestus is unwilling to nail Prometheus down. His feeling of kinship is strong with him, stronger than any sense of right and wrong in this particular issue (l. 14), and he bitterly regrets that it should be his smithwork that will be responsible for Prometheus' tortures. Thus he represents the craftsman whose craft is used by the tyrant to serve the very ends to which he himself would least willingly see them applied. Over against Hephaestus, the artist who is tortured to do the will of the tyrant and suffers in doing it, are the two brutal instruments called Might and Violence, embodied qualities, creatures who have no life other than as functioning cogs in the tyrant's machine. The natural feeling of affinity of god with god (which matches the natural affinity of one man with another within the closely knit Greek community) must give place to the brutal demand of the tyrant. The pertinence of this symbol in the life

⁴ A very detailed and specific political allegory is traced by E. G. Harman in his edition of *Prometheus* (London: Edward Arnold Co., 1920). His thesis seems to me too specific.

of the present dictatorial countries is an indication of its lasting quality.

Prometheus himself is the symbol of the clever man who lent assistance to the rising tyrant only to find that by so doing he sowed the seeds of the distrust which is inherent in the unlawful seizure of political power, and that on the first specific point of difference (in this case, disagreement about the future of man) gratitude for his political assistance is not merely forgotten but he himself severely punished.⁵ And it is as a political symbol that we must view Oceanus. He is the god who proved false to his kindred to placate the new tyrant. Now he believes that his influence with the enthroned sovereign is as great as his previous failure to oppose was important (ll. 340-41). Above all, in his conference with Prometheus he typifies the eternally compromising nature which is prepared to yield at every point in the certainty that resistance is in vain. The arguments adduced by Prometheus to bring about the abandonment of his mission as intermediary between Zeus and Prometheus are those designed to appeal to his placid cowardice. There is the fate of his kindred, for instance—the Giants whose attempts against Zeus he had failed to share—and the allusions to Typho's sufferings (l. 336). His daughters, the Oceanids, who constitute the Chorus of the play, are also political and human symbols. They represent the union of Oceanus' timid ignorance with an unswerving loyalty quite foreign to their father's nature. For with all their father's moderation—witness their repeated attempts to dissuade Prometheus from his attitude of intransigence—they still will not allow even their imminent destruction to interfere with their loyalty to their friend. "Tell us not to practice baseness," they say to Hermes in the last scene, when the thunder of Zeus is menacing them for their strong stand (l. 1066). The Oceanids are the complement of their father. Right up to the end of the play the Chorus never believes in Prometheus' prophecy of the fall of Zeus. Oceanus never hears of it. But ignorance does not always mean lack of courage. Though both Oceanus and the Chorus of Oceanids typify the conventional as opposed to the extraordinary level of the hero's intelligence, the diversification of the choric standard is illuminating. The Oceanids do not understand, but they love their friend and will not leave him. Their

⁵ See ll. 224-25.

father does not understand, but, without the anchor of their devotion, he drifts through vacillation and compromise to the abandonment of Prometheus.

CHARACTER SYMBOLISM ON THE LEVEL OF KNOWLEDGE
VERSUS FORCE

Since Prometheus is the symbol of knowledge in its struggle against brute force, he is bound by the two servants of Zeus—Might and Violence. Knowledge is on his side, for in his conversation with the Chorus at line 211 we learn that he is the son of Earth, or Themis, and that she has told him the design of the future which is unshakable.⁶ Themis had told him in the old days of the struggle between Zeus and Kronos, that violence would never win the day (ll. 214 f.), and he had endeavored in vain to convince his brother Titans that they must work by strategy rather than by force if they were to conquer. It is in virtue of this knowledge that he possesses a sure confidence that Zeus will ultimately be vanquished. The secret itself, the knowledge of which enables Prometheus to be brave in the face of torture, is a symbol of the ultimate superiority of knowledge over force.⁷ Aeschylus is at great pains to define exactly what he means by the immutable design of fate (of which Prometheus has the secret) as opposed to any power which Zeus may temporarily possess over Prometheus or over the world. In the dialogue between Prometheus and the Chorus at line 507, the Chorus says:

Help not mortals beyond what is fitting to the neglect of your own misfortunes. I am of good hope that were you once freed of these chains you will yet have strength no less than Zeus.

PROMETHEUS: It is not so that accomplishing Fate has yet determined it shall be. I must be bent and twisted with ten thousand tortures and pangs and so finally escape. Craft is far weaker than necessity.

CHORUS: Who is the steersman of necessity?

PROMETHEUS: The three-formed fates, and the remembering Furies.

CHORUS: Is Zeus weaker than these?

⁶ For the connection between Themis, Earth, and the oracular power, at Delphi in particular, see the opening of the *Eumenides*. On the significance of Earth throughout the play see a rather far-fetched study by G. M. Adams, "The Four Elements in the *Prometheus vinculus*," *Class. Phil.*, XXVIII (1933), 97-103.

⁷ Apparently the secret is Aeschylus' own contribution to the myth. There is no trace of it in the Hesiodic story (see H. Weir Smyth, *Aeschylean Tragedy* ["Sather Classical Lectures," Vol. II (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1924)], p. 105).

PROMETHEUS: Yes, for even he cannot escape that which is determined.

CHORUS: What then is fated for Zeus besides eternal rule?

PROMETHEUS: Do not seek to learn that; entreat me not.

CHORUS: It is a solemn secret that you guard so.

PROMETHEUS: Think of some other thing, for it is not yet the season to utter this. It must be hidden darkly. It is only by keeping this secret that I shall escape the shameful bonds and the tortures.⁸

This knowledge, in its alliance with the higher power of destiny, is contrasted forcibly with both the ignorance of the servants of the tyrant, Might and Violence, and the ignorance of Zeus himself. For instance, Might says at line 48:

All things are burdensome save only sovranty over the Gods. For there is none who is free save Zeus.

And again at line 86:

Falsely the Gods call you Forethought. For you yourself need forethought to wind your way out of this device.

The ignorance of Zeus is manifested in his dispatch of the god Hermes to compel Prometheus, under threat of further torture, to reveal the secret which shall ultimately unseat Zeus from heaven.

PROMETHEUS AS THE CHAMPION OF MAN AGAINST THE PERSECUTOR OF MAN

On the third level of character symbolism Prometheus is the champion of man against Zeus the persecutor of man. First, after his success in heaven, Zeus was fain to destroy man and make another

⁸ There is no explicit statement throughout the play that destiny is always just, even in the long run. That conclusion is clearly implied, however, in the way in which Prometheus appeals to the powers to witness his unjust treatment (l. 1093); and it is explicitly stated constantly throughout the *Agamemnon* trilogy, where the same distinction is made between the power of Zeus and the power of Fate (cf. *Choephoroi* 61-65; *Eum.* 1045-46. Finally, in the *Oresteia*, the will of Zeus would be synonymous with *Moirai*. This end has not yet been attained in the *Prometheus vincetus*. It is obvious that Aeschylus conceives of much personal injustice as part of the scheme of fate for the world in general. We do not need to look farther than the example of Io, whose torture at the hands of Zeus and wanderings through the world are all part of the design of fate which will bring her to the land of Nile and the birth of Epaphos. Prometheus himself is a sufferer in order that the will of fate may be fulfilled. In the passage quoted above, he tells how his "ten thousand tortures and pangs" are part of fate's plan, and at 268 he says: "I know of all this. Willingly, willingly I sinned. I shall not deny it. In helping mortals I found these troubles." It appears, then, that Aeschylus conceives of a generally just principle immanent in the working of the world, but the manifestations in the case of any single individual unit, from the short-range point of view of the individual, may be unjust.

creature in his place who should fulfil the purpose more efficiently. We are not told explicitly why Zeus wished to destroy man. There is no indication what sort of animal he wished to put in his place, but in so far as Prometheus in disobedience to Zeus enlightened man by the gift of intelligence, it may be assumed that Zeus's creation would have had no such dangerous potentialities of development. This first attempt to destroy mankind is almost certainly the flood of Deucalion, of which we hear elsewhere, and there is a tradition to the effect that Prometheus counseled Deucalion to the building of the ark which preserved him and his family. The second action in Prometheus' rescue of man from the enmity of the world in which he found himself is even more significant. "I stopped mortals from foreseeing doom," says Prometheus (l. 250).

CHORUS: What remedy against that disease did you find?

PROMETHEUS: I sowed in them blind hopes.

CHORUS: That is a great gift you gave to mortals.

As the rest of his gifts to man are all concerned with enlightenment,⁹ and, indeed, fire itself becomes a symbol of that enlightenment, this gift of "blind hopes" seems at first strange. Yet it is quite consistent. There is a passage in the *Gorgias* which is illuminating here.¹⁰ We are told that in the days of Kronos and when Zeus was newly king, men were informed as to the day of their death and were judged alive with all their clothes on and their possessions about them by live judges. This was a practice which brought much injustice, says Plato, and Zeus ultimately ordered it otherwise. Now Plato is using the myth for the illustration of his own theme, and we must not be surprised that his picture of the development of man when this was the state of things does not accord with that of Aeschylus. But the dating in the case of Plato shows that either he and Aeschylus were drawing on the same myth or else that Plato is borrowing from Aeschylus: "In the

⁹ See the lines: "They were as foolish children and I made them wise and gave them the possession of wits," and the entire passage describing the evolution of man under the guidance of Prometheus (ll. 442 ff.). All the arts of life and the practical devices of reason against environment were suggested by Prometheus. On the connection between these manifestations of Prometheus' beneficence and the worship of Prometheus in Attica see Gulick, "The Attic Prometheus," *Harvard Studies*, X (1889), 103-14. On fire as the symbol of enlightenment see W. Jaeger, *Paideia* (Berlin and Leipzig: De Gruyter, 1934), p. 336: "Das Feuer, diese Götterkraft, wird ihm zum Sinnbild der Kultur."

¹⁰ *Gorgias* 523 B.

days of Kronos and when Zeus was still newly king." What, then, is the meaning of the blind hopes which were the compensation for man's loss of knowledge of his death and yet left him able to use his reason to build houses and yoke horses and invent cures for sickness?

Let us recur to the nature of Prometheus' knowledge. He is wise in the wisdom of his mother Themis, or Earth, and consequently wise in the knowledge of destiny. This is not reason. It is knowledge absolute. The knowledge of the day of a man's death partakes of that quality, for it is in the province of destiny. So man at the beginning had an infinitely small particle of the *same kind of knowledge* which Prometheus enjoyed in large measure. Just as animals today seem to have a curious intuition of the coming of their death and crawl away into hiding to face it, so primitive man had this knowledge. And Prometheus caused them to cease to foreknow the day of their death. For the gift of reason, the supreme ally in their struggle against nature, made them fight on against death in "blind hope," even when the day of their death had come. It is worth noticing here that, of the two accounts of man's origins in the world—the one that of a golden age of material and moral perfection¹¹ and the other of miserable ignorance and helplessness—Aeschylus has preferred the scientific tradition. But he has chosen to incorporate in his account a grain of the truth of the former. The very small particle of absolute knowledge which man possessed was a spark of the divine. The fire itself, Prometheus' greatest and most celebrated gift to man, is a symbol of practical, not speculative, reason. And nowhere does Aeschylus assert that such speculative reason in its fulness will ever be in man's possession.

PROMETHEUS AS THE SYMBOL OF MAN

The last level of symbolism shows Prometheus not merely as the champion of man but in some way as the symbol of man himself in his conflict against powers which control him in his helplessness. It is the story of the man-god who must suffer for his kindness to man by having his state equated with theirs. In the case of Prometheus, the good which is achieved for man is achieved before the suffering (which comes in the nature of a punishment). In the case of Christ the pun-

¹¹ Hesiod *Ἔργα καὶ ἡμέραι* 110.

ishment is in a mystical sense the direct antecedent of the benefit which man will obtain. The cry of Prometheus at 267—

All of these things I knew. In knowledge, in knowledge I sinned. I will not deny it. In helping man I found my troubles. But I did not think that with such sufferings as these I should be wasted away on the beetling crags—

is the cry of the Savior who is man enough to be weak under pain. Without this sense of kinship with man, no tragic hero can communicate his tragedy. It is the Christ on the cross who cries, "God, why hast thou forsaken me?" The essence of this symbolism is that Prometheus, though possessed of a knowledge of destiny and therefore of victory in the end, should for the present be at the mercy of a brutal and ignorant opponent. So, too, is the mortal Io. So are all the mortals over whom Death holds power against which they fight with "blind hopes." Finally, on this symbolic level there is Prometheus' deliverance by Heracles, who is part god and part man. This once again binds his fate to the creature whom he has helped to survive in the teeth of the opposition of the supreme god.¹²

So much for the symbols superimposed one on another in the structure of the play. There still remains to be seen what is the nature of the dramatic process in this symbolic form of drama. What I have attempted so far is to show that the character of Prometheus does not have a single particular aspect but rather a number of aspects on various levels, each level being worked out into an integrated whole,

¹² We should notice that there are two parts to Prometheus' rescue from his present suffering. The one is his actual deliverance by Heracles (l. 774); the other is his reconciliation with Zeus elicited by the threat of the secret. At 260 Prometheus announces that a term will be placed to his pain only "when Zeus decides." This is in line with the general prediction of Themis that "not by force but by craft shall the conquerors win the victory." It would be inconsistent with the opposition between Prometheus as Wisdom and Zeus as Violence if Prometheus were to win by means of his adversary's weapons. Yet in view of 774 it is plain that Heracles delivers him and that the reconciliation with Zeus is the reinstatement of Prometheus in his former honors in heaven. This must be the meaning of the "retribution" (l. 177) which Zeus will be forced to pay the Titan. We may wonder whether the release of Prometheus from his rock was effected with the consent of Zeus or without it. At 772 the Chorus asks, "Who will release you *against the will of Zeus?*" and the answer, "It is Fate's will that one of your [Io's] descendants shall be the deliverer," may assume that he will do so "against the will of Zeus." But there were apparently compromises on the side of Prometheus; for Hermes at 1027 at least threatens that some god must be found who is willing to be a substitute for Prometheus and surrender his immortality, and the legend recounts that such a sacrifice was made by the centaur Chiron, already in deathly agony as the result of Heracles' arrow, yet condemned by his godhead to an immortality of pain.

and that the story of Prometheus on these several levels is the symbol of all manner of movements in heaven and earth from the rebel against the tyrant to man against god.

PLOT

As I have indicated before, narrative takes the place of action, and the play may be divided into acts according to the interlocutor of Prometheus involved. The first act is the nailing of Prometheus by Might and Violence aided by Hephaestus; the second, the dialogue between Prometheus and the Chorus; the third, between Prometheus and Oceanus; the fourth, between Prometheus and the Chorus; the fifth, between Prometheus and Io; the sixth, a short one, with the Chorus again; and, finally, the Epilogue, like the Prologue, brings Prometheus openly face to face with his enemies, who again use the only weapon they have against him—cruelty and violence. The progressive clarification of the issues between the two opposites on all the levels is conditioned by the character of Prometheus' interlocutors. The Chorus holds a dual position in this play of gods and demigods: it is part the conventional listener and norm of conduct, part also a close friend of Prometheus. It finally manifests its loyalty and affection for him in the most unusual and striking way by consenting to suffer along with him. To the Chorus Prometheus' personal troubles of the past are unfolded, both as concerns man and as concerns the general political issue. Oceanus is significant only on the political issue, and so in the scenes with him nothing about man or the ultimate hope of deliverance based on the knowledge of Destiny is explained. For Io, both as a fellow-sufferer at the hands of the tyrant Zeus and as the future mother of Prometheus' deliverer who shall be the demigod, the exposition of the three themes—that of man, that of wisdom, and the political issue—are pertinent. The fourth theme, the man-god against Zeus, is explained in Prometheus' own person alone, in the thought of the entire piece, and in the violence of the Prologue and the Epilogue. In the long stretches of narration, each one probing the further recesses of the particular level of symbols at which it works, we have the ancient counterpart of Mr. Bloom's interior monologue.

The statement of the drama is an exposition of the present entirely

in terms of the past and the future.¹³ The present, as present, is relevant only in so far as it illustrates Prometheus' helplessness in the face of Zeus's power. It is, as I have remarked before, the level of the suffering Prometheus-Christ, but this level can be made articulate only by the comment of the spectators, as in the initial expressions of grief on the part of the Chorus, or by the occasional outbursts of Prometheus himself or by the opening and closing scenes of physical suffering.

In the first scene, to the accompaniment of the blows dealt by the unwilling Hephaestus, we have the past and the future expressed in their simplest terms. The past is the sin of Prometheus in giving fire to man; the future is, in the opinion of Might, endless suffering for Prometheus until he learns, "for all his wit, that he is duller than Zeus" (l. 62).¹⁴

When the torturers are gone, Prometheus' soliloquy between lines 95 and 102 gives the simplest statement of the past, present, and future scheme again, but with the additional fact established that Prometheus' vision is superior to that of Might in virtue of Prometheus' parentage. This enables him to know that the result of the torture will not be what Might imagines (ll. 10-11) nor will it be eternal, as is insinuated at 87. Hence, we have our knowledge versus brute force dialectic with its first postulate: the superior nature of Prometheus' knowledge.

In Prometheus' dialogue with the Chorus at 190 ff. we have a further clarification of the future. We learn now, not only that Prometheus knows a conclusion different from that adumbrated in the first scene (l. 102) but that it is a secret in Prometheus' possession which shall unseat the tyrant, and that only contrition and reparation on the part of Zeus will induce Prometheus to disclose this secret. So up to the present we have the theme of the champion of man against his persecutor and the contest between knowledge and brute force.

¹³ This division for the first scene is worked out in George Thomson's edition of the *Prometheus Bound* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1932).

¹⁴ There is, of course, dramatic irony in the words of Might, "From which of your sufferings will your mortals be able to relieve you?" since the audience is aware that the deliverer is to be Heracles, half-man, half-god.

At 197 we revert to the past, and we now see the beginnings of the political myth. Also a clear distinction is made between the two symbolic levels—Prometheus the benefactor of man and Prometheus the rebel against the tyrant Zeus (cf. ll. 200 and 227). They are tied together by the cunning statement that the predisposing cause for Zeus's distrust of Prometheus was the uneasy sense of benefits received, and the championship of man was the specific *aitia* of which he availed himself to condemn his erstwhile supporter. On the political level Prometheus takes his account into the past when Zeus-Peistratus (or Cypselus or Lygdamis) was seeking support for his attempt upon the legitimate monarch, his own father Kronos. This part he sums up in the words, "It is the disease of tyranny not to trust its friends" (l. 227). We then pass on straight to Prometheus' help to man. The past is now beginning to be clearer. We can see that Zeus's conduct, which up to now has been explained purely as a punishment inflicted on an offense of a god against a god (l. 10), has deeper roots. It is fixed not only in Prometheus' help to man but also in the past of Zeus himself. In the account of the championship of man we hear first of the rescue from the flood,¹⁵ but that is followed by the statement of Prometheus' gift of intelligence to man most concretely instanced by the granting of fire.

The entrance of Oceanus brings us back to the strictly political myth in the past. Oceanus is the timorous adherent of the tyrant whose indifference may have some value to Zeus-Peistratus on his upward path, but whose value is now negligible. No editor, as far as I know, until the publication of the recent excellent translation of Miss Edith Hamilton,¹⁶ has realized the irony of Prometheus' treatment of this figure. This ancient god enters riding on a hippocampus, and we have allusions to this rather comic monster at 288 and 396. There is nothing but mocking laughter in Prometheus' first remarks, and there is contemptuous scorn in "I envy you, since you have kept out of the range of accusation, you who bore hand and daring with me in all" (ll. 332-33). There is no record in the rest of the play or in mythology, as far as I can discover, of any assistance ever lent to rebels by the chicken-hearted Oceanus. The words of Prometheus are, I suggest,

¹⁵ This is presumably the meaning of l. 237.

¹⁶ *Three Greek Plays* (New York: W. W. Norton Co., 1937).

pure sarcasm like his greeting, "Have you come here as an *epoptes* of my troubles . . . or have you come as a spectator, a sympathizer?" (ll. 300 ff.). For Oceanus' pacific mission as intermediary he has only the caustic comment that he sees in it "nothing but unnecessary trouble and empty-headed, silly good nature" (l. 385). Prometheus knows that Oceanus is an insignificant lightweight, and it is clear that Aeschylus is using the scene to show the part played by the silly, cowardly, and yet not ill-natured partisans of the tyrant. Besides, for Prometheus there can be no compromise on terms of apology and explanation. There must be a logical conclusion to the essentially intellectual and moral differences between himself and Zeus.

The complete exposition of Oceanus' point of view makes it unnecessary for Prometheus to embroider at greater length the aspects of the political squabble with Zeus before man became a factor in the quarrel (l. 437). But the rejection of Oceanus' advice, an advice which the Chorus itself is more than half-disposed to approve, forces Prometheus to tell of his aims in the succor of mankind in order to avoid the charge of obstinacy (l. 436). Thus the transition from one level to the other is made very naturally, following a natural trend of thought in the previous scene. So we get the final clarification of the championship of man in the past in its most significant form (l. 505).

From 508 to 525 we have a further explanation of the future on the level of knowledge versus brute force. It is the clear statement of the circumstances which make it impossible that Zeus's rule over the world can be eternal. It is a corollary of the statement of the nature of Prometheus' knowledge. At 102 and 205 we learned that Necessity is unconquerable and that Prometheus' mother is acquainted with the designs of destiny. Now we are told the exact nature of the relation of Zeus's power to the inexorable destiny. We do not yet know, however, in what way destiny will interfere in Zeus's plans for eternal lordship.

The episode of Io which follows is at first sight the most puzzling thing in the play. It is very long and looks like a poetic geographical tour of the Greek world. However, a closer study will show Io's integral relation to the play as a whole. She is, as I have said before, the one of the three friendly interlocutors to whom the culmination of everything on three levels—wisdom versus force, champion of man versus persecutor of man, rebel versus tyrant—in the future can be

explained. So we have the final story of the secret which will cause Zeus's fall (l. 755), the explanation of the marriage and the part played by it in forcing from Zeus an acknowledgment of the injustice done to Prometheus. We have the culmination of the championship of man theme; for Heracles, who will deliver Prometheus, is that culmination, being half-man, half-god, and the highest evolution of the animal to whom Prometheus granted intelligence as the first step up from the primeval slime. And at 760 the threat to the tyrant, the loss of the throne, is the last step but one in the revelation of the movement started when Prometheus backed Zeus in his revolt against his father. Even the long arid stretches of geography have a contrapuntal value in the structure of the trilogy; for from the fragments it is apparent that they match the wanderings of Heracles in the second play. Possibly also George Thomson is right in conjecturing that both Io and Heracles are parts of a further symbolism, Io the moon, and Heracles the zodiac, and possibly the thirty thousand years of Prometheus' imprisonment signify the cycle of time in the Orphic tradition.¹⁷

Again it is worth noticing how appositely the entrance of Io is prepared by the choral ode which asks, "What help can there be for you in creatures of a day?" (l. 547). She, as the future ancestor of Heracles, is to furnish the answer to the question. The Chorus at 888 with their speculations on the unwisdom of such unequal marriages as those of Io lead the thought naturally to the last of the dialogues between themselves and Prometheus. The future of Zeus's marriage, the birth of the son who shall overthrow the father, is now the most engrossing theme for Prometheus. In this dialogue and in the last scene with Hermes he no longer speaks as if the secret were to be a means of bargaining. It is now the hope cherished by Prometheus that he will one day see his hated enemy plunged in such misery as his own. He must know, as the decrees of destiny are absolute, that no such punishment will be accorded him as satisfaction, that Zeus will necessarily make terms. But at the moment of his blind rage he chooses to picture rather the hurt of a foe than the benefit to himself. It is a subtle psychological touch for the ending of the first part of the trilogy.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

¹⁷ Thomson, *op. cit.*, p. 38. On the thirty thousand years see Smyth, *op. cit.*, p. 106.

PLAUTINE TECHNIQUE IN DELAYED EXITS

JOHN N. HOUGH

SCENE endings in the plays of Plautus are variously brought about. One familiar device is the delayed exit wherein the intent or order to leave is indicated a number of lines before the actual departure. Of these delays some are necessitated by a new development of the plot; others are clearly intentional and suitable to the action; others are not unreasonably long replies by the departing character to the person who mentioned the exit. Excluding all such natural delays, there remain a considerable number of instances in which the indication of departure is followed by a passage frequently unconnected in thought with the preceding and occasionally of considerable length.¹ The results of an analysis of these passages are presented in this paper.

All examples perform one or more of the following dramatic functions: (1) to explain the past or prepare for the future movement of characters off stage (*Am.* 969-84; *As.* 369-80, 740-45; *Au.* 696-700, 802-7; *Po.* 197-207; *Ps.* 1230-37; *St.* 150-96, 263-73, 446-53; *An.* 171-74, 524-31); (2) to explain the intrigue through asides, instructions, or discussions of plans (*Am.* 542-50, 969-83; *As.* 107-26, 231-42; *Au.* 81-119, 273-81, 660-81, 696-700, 802-7; *Cap.* 126-460; *Cu.* 203-14; *Ep.* 305-19; *Mer.* 327-34, 582-87; *M.G.* 183-259, 857-66; *Pe.* 147-64; *Po.* 801-9; *St.* 150-96; *Tri.* 190-98, 806-18; *Eu.* 363-90; *Hec.* 358-495; *Ph.* 777-83); and (3) to amuse the audience by physical or verbal horseplay (*As.* 107-17, 369-80, 490-504; *Ba.* 757-60; *Cap.* 126-94; *Cas.* 490-503, 526-30; *Ci.* 111-16; *Cu.* 516-26; *Ep.* 63-80, 512-20; *Men.* 844-75; *Mer.* 817-29; *M.G.* 808-12; *Pe.* 745-52, 693-710; *Po.* 428-48, 607-8, 911-17; *Ps.* 1230-37; *Ru.* 860-67, 885-91; *St.* 574-623; *Tri.* 581-90; *Tru.* 331-33; *An.* 708-15; *Eu.* 213-24).

Two important facts are apparent from this list. There are no de-

¹ It might seem at first that such passages were merely intended to give the actor time to walk from center stage to the wing. This may well have been done in actual performance, but that it was not the purpose of the delayed exit is proved by the fact that they are rare in Terence, nonexistent in Menander, and that the great majority of scenes have no words indicating departure, or have them in the final line.

layed exits in Menander;² those in Terence are few and, upon closer inspection, prove in all cases more nearly to approximate the natural or intentional delays employed by all dramatists. The delayed exit, therefore, is virtually a Plautine phenomenon.

Seven³ of the delayed exits listed in the first group appear to have as their purpose the retention of a departing character so that he may speak the name of an oncoming character, thereby identifying the latter for the audience. These identifications, abundant in both Plautus and Terence, are so much more often manipulated without benefit of delay that there is no justification for seeking any further connection between the two. Furthermore, in five⁴ of the seven cases the identification is unnecessary because it has been done before or is otherwise provided for, and in no single instance is the identification clearly the sole, or even the main, purpose of the delay.⁵ Apparently, the coincidence of character announcement and delayed exit is accidental.

The other three passages cited in the first group explain to the audience off-stage movements through the garden and *angiportus*. This type of dramatic manipulation occurs neither in Menander nor in Terence, but in Plautus three times in delayed exits. In all cases it arbitrarily controls stage movements which are not natural, and in one case (*As.* 740-45) it is difficult to escape the conclusion that it was introduced by Plautus to effect a transition from one Greek original to another.⁶ In the other two cases it is combined with material certainly Plautine in origin (*St.* 446-53, the explanation that the audience

² There are some natural delays, e.g., *Samia* 172-79. The nearest thing in Menander to a delayed exit is *Peri.* 172, but here the straightforward change of mind could be well taken care of in the acting, and furthermore the thought pursued in the "delay" is the same as that which actuated the abandoned exit.

³ *Am.* 969; *As.* 369; *Au.* 696, 802; *Po.* 197; *St.* 150, 263.

⁴ Only in *Au.* 696-700 and *St.* 263-73 is the oncoming character not otherwise known to the audience.

⁵ *As.* 369-80 has the humorous qualities of the third type; both *Aulularia* passages and *St.* 263 appear in the second group. The facts relating to *Po.* 197-207 are complicated and involve other things than the mere announcement of the girls' identity. The exit and re-entry of Agorastocles at 197 and 207 looks very much like a Plautine manipulation concomitant with the deletion of Milphio's exit with or after Agorastocles', but in any case before the entrance of the girls. The identification function of Milphio is hardly necessary, for the girls identify themselves in short order. Even the conservative view of Fraenkel marks the girls' scene (210-409) as an insertion, not from the Greek original (see below, n. 16).

⁶ For the full argument see Hough, *AJP*, LVIII (1937), 33-34.

should not be surprised at the way slaves act in Greece; *Ps.* 1230-37, a reference to the *comitia centuriata*, the personification of a birthday,⁷ and a type of humor peculiar to Plautus, the deliberate humorous comment on the delay itself; the scene which this exit brings to an end is itself probably a conglomerate composition of Greek and Roman elements).⁸

The evidence of this group shows, first, that, although the character-announcing technique contributes nothing to the study of the delayed exit, most of the examples do have features in common with other passages to be discussed later and, second, that delayed exits which have in common the manipulation of stage movements are probably Plautine.

Passages in the second group contain material dealing with the intrigue. But they do not contain anything of vital import not otherwise presented unless the delay is so long as virtually to equal another scene (*Pe.* 147-64; *M.G.* 183-259), or is a monologue delivered to the audience (*Ep.* 305-19).⁹ The delayed exit is not, of course, a suitable position for important material since it partakes of the nature of an afterthought and may well have been missed by careless ears. The content of these passages is, then, of little importance in itself. But looked at from another point of view, the material and the deliberately inconspicuous position it holds become significant. It is impossible here to treat each passage in detail in its relation to the theories of the dramatic composition of each play, but such a study shows that many of the delayed exits contain material which in all probability was written by Plautus to smooth over alterations he had made in the originals, i.e., the evidence points to the same conclusion as it does in the case of the manipulation of stage movements. This conclusion is strengthened by the fact that Terence, who was so much more skilful in concealing his alterations, offers but two examples which could by any possibility be construed in this manner (*Eu.* 362, in which the eunuch motif is introduced in a delayed exit, and *Hec.* 358-495, where Pamphilus, though saying he will follow his mother indoors, remains

⁷ Identified by Fraenkel as Plautine (*Plaut. im Plaut.* [Berlin, 1922], p. 109, An. 2).

⁸ Hough, *The Composition of the "Pseudolus"* (Princeton University diss. [Lancaster, Pa.: Lancaster Press, 1931]), pp. 89 ff.

⁹ The only exception is *Tri.* 190-98, in which the information, merely that Lesbonicus is still living in the annex, is of no importance.

for several scenes to enter into new activities).¹⁰ Terence usually did his recasting more skilfully and did not employ the awkward delayed-exit device.

The evidence for Plautus' use of the delayed exit to solve problems of composition depends on the following passages. *As.* 117-26: although Demaenetus says he is leaving (107) for the same destination as his slave, he permits the slave to depart first (117) and remains to speak a totally unimportant monologue (117-26). The purpose of this delay and monologue is to cover up the fact that in the original Demaenetus left as indicated and the slave remained for a following scene. *As.* 231-42 contain the first mention of a motif which Plautus uses later in the play, but which belonged to an original other than the 'Οραγός. This motif Plautus had to introduce into an early scene in the *Asinaria*; he did so by tacking it onto an 'Οραγός scene, in a delayed exit.¹¹ The movements of Strobilus in the *Aulularia* are so mechanically manipulated and his role so thoroughly unsatisfactory that, although no general agreement has been reached regarding his place in the original, there is good reason to believe that Plautus does not represent it unaltered. Lesbonicus' two awkward delays (696, 802), listed above as examples of character-announcing, enter vitally into any discussion of Strobilus' role in the original. There is certainly no other character in Plautus who causes as serious a discrepancy in the movements of the introducer, especially since in the second case the introduction is superfluous. Though the details are uncertain, it is not unlikely that Plautus has had his hand in these passages.¹²

The peculiar movements of Hegio in *Cap.* 126-494 have been partially responsible for the somewhat drastic remedies suggested for the

¹⁰ In the most recent work on Terence, *Hec.* 358 has been considered evidence of just the sort of alteration under discussion in Plautus (cf. W. E. J. Kuiper, *Two Plays by Apollodorus of Carystus* [Leyden, 1938], pp. 15-16).

¹¹ For full details of both *Asinaria* passages see Hough, *AJP*, LVIII (1937), 20-31. The delayed exit at *As.* 490-504 is also, I believe, the result of compositional problems, but they are not so clear as these. It has other features which couple it with those discussed in the third group.

¹² In *Au.* 660-81 Strobilus is again involved in a delayed exit which, though not so clearly involved in dramatic handling, is a clear piece of manipulation designed to reveal to him the location of the pot of gold. There is no evidence of Plautine rehandling here except that the awkward movements of Strobilus are, because of the other passages, a suspicious circumstance in themselves (cf. Dziatzko, *Rh. Mus.*, XXXVII [1882], 286).

difficulties of this play. Though Herzog's opinion¹³ that Ergasilus did not come from the original has not found favor, it is significant that this parasite is first introduced in a delayed exit. At 194 occurs the only example in Plautus of a character changing his intended destination without reason and announcing said change. Hegio departs and returns (251) and eventually leaves again (460) to the destination originally determined upon in 126. There is no reason for Hegio's exit at 194 except to give Tyndarus and Philocrates an opportunity to converse alone and plan their deception, but these plans have already been explained in the prologue. Hegio's movements in 126 and 194 are clearly controlled by some arbitrary plan of the author, but whether he be Plautus cannot be definitely established. In any case, this delayed exit of Hegio is inextricably bound up with Plautus' handling of the play and particularly with the awkward introduction of Ergasilus (127) and the more awkward exit of both Ergasilus and Hegio. It is significant that the scene between 126 and 194 is full of Roman material which, in its present form at least, cannot be a mere translation of the Greek.

In *M.G.* 182-259 *Periplectomenus*, though ordered indoors by *Palaestrio*, remains while *Palaestrio* invents the twin-sister trick and leaves seventy lines later with an entirely new set of instructions. In the complicated structure of this controversial play, the fact that a delayed exit provides the place for a change in trick is most significant. The hand of Plautus is seen in certain parts of the intervening passage as well.¹⁴ The delayed exit in *M.G.* 857-66 has as its sole purpose the informing of *Palaestrio* of *Philocomasium's* activities in carrying out her part of the intrigue. The informer is *Lucio*, who generally is agreed to be alien to the Greek original.

Po. 801-9 is a peculiar passage. If *Collybiscus* exits naturally at 805, *Agorastocles*, at 809, thinks he is still on stage. This is a touch of humor which, if properly acted, is effective but unique in Plautus. If *Collybiscus* does not leave at 805, the passage becomes a delayed exit,¹⁵

¹³ Herzog, *Fleck. Jahrb.*, CXIII (1876), 373, and T. A. Kakridis, *Barbara Plautina* (Athens, 1904).

¹⁴ Roman references (211) and the use of Greek words (cf. Hough, *AJP*, LV [1934], 356).

¹⁵ Cf. also *Men.* 844-75 for a delayed exit which ceases to be one if acted with intelligence. If *Menaechmus* is between the *senex* and the exit, the action is smooth and the change from summoning slaves to calling the doctor is natural.

and its inclusion here is important because his last speech deals with the *exta*, a motif closely bound up with all theories of contamination.¹⁶ At *St.* 154 Crocotium intends to leave to get Gelasimus, who enters (155) unseen by her, soliloquizes, and is greeted by her at 196, thus permitting her to summon him without departing. Although her long awkward delay could be managed by proper acting (cf. stage directions in Loeb ed.), the delay is not occasioned by a change in situation that she knows but which is arbitrarily imposed upon her. This delay coincides with the introduction of Gelasimus, a character drawn from a different original, probably, from that of the preceding scene.¹⁷

Balancing these nine passages in which the Plautine rehandling in the delayed exits is as nearly established as the study of plot structure can make it, are the other eight passages listed in this group.¹⁸ They deal with matters of plot, but not in such a way as to tie them definitely to probable contamination or curtailing. They are superfluous in that the material contained is of no importance because it has all been given before. That Plautus was responsible for this repetition cannot be proved, but a comparison of his repetitious habits with the lack of it in Menander and Terence considerably lightens the burden of proof. There is no single passage in the entire group which need have come in even approximately its present form from the Greek original. This is as far as one can go in positive statement. The possibility of their Plautine origin is clearly demonstrated.

The third type of material found in delayed exits is a composite of jokes, puns, banter, rapid physical action, and in general those quali-

¹⁶ Leo, *Plaut. Forsch.* (2d ed.; Berlin, 1912), pp. 170 ff.; Fraenkel, *op. cit.*, pp. 262 ff.; Jachmann, *Plaut. u. Attisches* (Berlin, 1931), pp. 195 ff. Cf. also *Po.* 190-97, above, n. 5 (Fraenkel, *op. cit.*, p. 270), where the exit is delayed, and eventually abandoned, because of the change in situation caused by the girls' appearance. This is not the same kind of thing as appears at *Peri.* 160-84, where a change of mind simply results in a different character's leaving than was at first planned.

¹⁷ This was the opinion of Fraenkel (*op. cit.*, p. 286), and whether or not Pinacium's duplication of Gelasimus' supposed task is considered further evidence for Plautine alteration, the fact remains that, whatever effort is made to prove a parallel for this passage either in Greek or in Plautus, Crocotium does not really introduce Gelasimus at all, for she does not even see him until after he has spoken forty lines. Gelasimus names himself (174), and the husbands' arrival is foreshadowed in 148-49 without the aid of 150-54. These two functions are not, therefore, enough to justify the passage (cf., contra, P. W. Harsh, *Studies in Dramatic "Preparation" in Roman Comedy* [Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1935], p. 19, n. 2).

¹⁸ *Am.* 542, 969; *Au.* 81, 273; *Cu.* 203; *Mer.* 327, 582; *Tri.* 806.

ties which are so characteristic of the humor of Plautus' comedies.¹⁹ There are two important points in connection with these passages. First, in the main they either are unconnected in thought with that which had preceded the indication of the exit or are clearly elaborations or extensions of the preceding. Second, the material of six of them is demonstrably Plautine, not Greek, and the material of ten others suggests the same conclusion, though it cannot be proved. In many cases both features prevail. The passages need only brief annotation here. The following contain indubitably Roman material: *Cas.* 527-30, 490-503;²⁰ *Pe.* 745-52;²¹ *Ps.* 1232-36;²² and *Rud.* 860-67,²³ 885-91.²⁴ Other passages which have all the earmarks of Plautine origin but which lack some definite Roman joke or other reference as proof are

¹⁹ Similarity between delayed exits stops with the nature of the material; there is no regular method of introducing them. The only formula employed with any frequency is the *numquid vis* question, asked usually by the person about to leave (occasionally by another). What follows may be a delayed exit. But as frequently as not that which follows is a natural afterthought to what precedes, or else the *numquid vis* is answered merely with a "Nothing," and the expected exit follows immediately. In the majority of cases of the formula, or its variants, there is no delayed exit. Similarly, the expression *ambula in ius*, though followed twice (*Pe.* 745 and *Rud.* 860) by a delayed exit and used also in the questionable case (*Cu.* 621, cf. n. 28 below), is employed by Terence with no delay (*Ph.* 936) and in variant form by Plautus: *in ius te voco* (*As.* 480 [secl. Ussing]), which precedes a delayed exit by ten lines and has nothing to do with it; *ite in ius* (three times) (*Po.* 1225-34), *eamus tu in ius* (*Tru.* 839). The only feature which any of these have in common is the obviously Roman reference in *antestatio* (*Persa* and *Curculio*) and the general Roman tone of the passages in *Curculio*, *Persa*, *Rudens*, and *Poenulus*. The importance of these facts to the argument of this paper has nothing to do with their appearance after the formula. That the three delayed exits are introduced by the formula with *ambula*, while forms of *eo* and *voco* are used elsewhere, is obviously of no consequence. The study of verbal formulas contributes nothing to the problem of the delayed exit.

²⁰ Latin puns (cf. Fraenkel, *op. cit.*, p. 49, for full discussion). Both passages also reveal Plautus' hand in the handling of Greek words (cf. Hough, *AJP*, LV [1934], 346-64).

²¹ *Praetor* and *antestatio* (cf. n. 19).

²² Cf. above, n. 7.

²³ Latin pun (*avezi* and *provezi*). The exit does not materialize owing to a change in situation caused by the entrance of a new character; the delay before the change, however, constitutes a valid example of the technique. *Hic verbum sat* (866) suggests an arbitrary ending of an interpolation. This is a type of management frequent in Plautus, and it occurs only at places suspected of Plautine authorship (cf. Fraenkel, *op. cit.*, p. 143). H. W. Prescott (*TAPA*, LXIII [1932], 123) finds this passage Roman on entirely different grounds. It is a filler designed to permit Trachalio (exit 859) to change costume and reappear as Charmides (enter 868).

²⁴ The Roman character of this passage is attested by Fraenkel (*op. cit.*, p. 37) in exactly the terms which this study applies to delayed exits: "eine der typischen Erweiterungen der altercatio."

As. 369-80;²⁵ 490-504;²⁶ Ba. 757-60;²⁷ Cu. 516-26;²⁸ Ep. 63-80;²⁹ Mer. 817-29;³⁰ Pe. 693-710;³¹ Po. 428-48;³² 911-17;³³ Tri. 581-90;³⁴ and

²⁵ Prolongation of preparation for the impersonation merely to warn us that Libanus may receive a punch in the jaw.

²⁶ Humorous banter prolonging a scene which came naturally to an end at 490. Of all those here listed, this passage is the least Roman in tone, but it contains a line (496) inconsistent with the context and material which before (n. 11) has been cited as evidence that it is part of an alteration caused by curtailing the original.

²⁷ Roman color of *O imperatorem probum*; alliteration; official pomposity of 760; comic *fugimus* (Fritzsche, *fugiamus*, codd.; *fugimus* [present] scans). The few scattered examples in New Comedy of βαδίζω, ελπίχουαι, and, once, ὡς ὁρᾷς ἀναστρίφω (Peri. 190) are all used less effectively than the many occurrences in Plautus of *abeo, iam hic ero, fugio*, etc., the perfect tense for the future (Men. 225), and present of verb of returning (Ba. 1052).

²⁸ Coarse humor of *leno* virtuously pleading for kind treatment of a girl he has just sold and being well set on his heels for his trouble—a type of humor characteristically Plautine (Mer. 208, Ps. 292). At Cu. 621 the haling of Therapontigonus to court is delayed by an *antestatio* joke (see n. 19 above) and physical horseplay to 628, when, without motivation, Phaedromus asks an irrelevant question which arbitrarily inaugurates the *anagnorisis*. It looks like a binding of different scenes by the delayed-exit technique, but with the exit itself abandoned, for no character leaves the stage until the end of the play. This strong resemblance to Ru. 860 and to the kind of structural problems which we have seen handled in delayed exits in the second group discussed might seem to give Cu. 621 a more prominent place in this paper than a footnote. Though it may add strength to the argument, it has been omitted in order not to confuse the issue, for it is not strictly a delayed exit.

²⁹ Repeated efforts to leave (72-78), humorous application of pompous phrase (77), alliteration (74), *figura etymologica* (78), typical Plautine joke (74-76) are all evidence that, even if a Greek passage lie behind, it has been drastically re-worked. Other Plautine interpolations have been identified in this scene (cf. Fraenkel, *op. cit.*, p. 117).

³⁰ Moralizing on the inequality of divorce laws. P. J. Enk (*Plauti Mercator* [Leyden, 1932], *ad loc.*) compares the speech of Syra to Euripides *Medea* 184, 230, 244 and *Electra* 1036, and quotes Leo (*op. cit.*, pp. 120-21) to show the suitability of Eutychus' hurrying off after hearing such startling news while the old, slow Syra bustles and hobbles as fast as she can, but of course more slowly than the young man. Enk, however, concedes that the material fits Roman society better than Greek (cf. H. E. Wedeck, *CW*, XXI [1928], 116).

³¹ Opportunity to introduce the twin-brother joke and his three-line name made up of Roman compounds, and described as *contortuplicata*, a Plautine *hapax legomenon*.

³² Rapid-fire exclamations with amusing *adynata* and seven lines of silly repetitious broken phrases the Plautine tone of which even the severest critic will be able to feel more than prove.

³³ Two proverbs for neither of which is a Greek counterpart known (cf. Otto, *Sprichwörter der Römer* [Leipzig, 1890], p. 65), a sarcastic joke, comment on the delay itself (cf. Ps. 1230), and alliteration throughout.

³⁴ Humorous repetition of *i modo*, a poor attempt at the type of humor employed in the *licet* and *censeo* scenes in *Rudens*. Cf. also Mer. 953-56, a brief delay at the end of a scene probably Plautine (cf. T. Frank, *AJP*, LIII [1932], 243-48).

Tru. 331-33.³⁵ *As.* 107-17 and *Cap.* 126-94, which have already shown evidence of Plautine rehandling for purposes of dramatic construction, contain jokes of a suspiciously Roman nature.³⁶ Five other exits are delayed apparently for the sake of a pithy phrase (*Ci.* 111-16, *Ep.* 512-20, *M.G.* 808-12, *Po.* 667-8, and *St.* 574-76) which in itself contains no evidence of source but in tone is similar to the other passages.³⁷ The evidence of the passages in this group as a whole³⁸ indicates that the delayed exits are Plautine expansions of or additions to an original scene ending which may have supplied the kernel of the thought, either before the original indication of exit or immediately thereafter. That the theme may have been suggested in the Greek is, of course, no argument against Plautine authorship of the delayed section, for if it was the kind of humor which he thought would appeal

³⁵ Example par excellence of a recall solely for its own sake. Diniarchus calls Asaphium back only to ask, "Why did I call you back?" (or "The devil take me for having called you back"—either interpretation is germane to the argument), to which she replies with extreme alliteration but to no other purpose.

³⁶ *As.* 110; *Cap.* 160-65, 183-90. The latter are certainly Plautine additions to the scene, whether it came from one Greek original or another.

³⁷ *M.G.* 808 also involves the mention of Dicea, a motif usually considered of prime import in the structural problem of the play.

³⁸ An additional example is so marred by textual difficulties that I have not thought it wise to include it in the text. The exit usually marked at *Po.* 1154 is delayed from 1149 so that Agorastocles may say, "Facies modo quam memores mavelim" (cf. *Ps.* 1230), and Milphio may bully some slaves. Plautine material appears in 1146 (Fraenkel, *op. cit.*, p. 49). Further delay in 1169-73 is bracketed by certain scholars on whom Leo depended for a number of reasons which will not stand scrutiny. (Leo [(*ed. maior*, Berlin, 1895), *ad loc.*] brackets 1162-65 and 1169-73 with this comment: "breviorem recensionem efficere videntur v. 1146. 1162-65. 1169-73," and refers to O. Seyffert, *Stud. Plaut.* [1874], p. 10; Schueth, *De Poen. Plauti quaest. crit.* [Bonn, 1883], pp. 31 ff.; and Langrehr, *De Plauti Poen.* [Progr. Friedland, 1883], p. 21. Milphio's apparent conviction of Hanno's sincerity in 1135 is no reason to delete 1169-71. Not thinking of the logic of his words forty lines later, Milphio is simply impelled, as is Agorastocles in 1168, to comment on the peculiarity of the situation. Verses 1169-73 are deleted because Milphio is supposed to have left the stage at 1154, but on this point see below.) Consideration of stage action would have prevented deletion, for proper stage directions can easily guide the action. Verses 1147-73 then become a single delayed exit in which there is Plautine padding at the beginning and probably also at the end (1167-68), where the Roman tone of Agorastocles' joke and the lame line which serves to introduce it are based on a Roman *double entendre*. Probably 1169-73 are Roman, for the framework of the scene certainly ends with 1166; their absence from the Greek was clear enough to Leo. Whatever bracketing is here done—1169-73, 1162-65, or both—only serves to show that *retractores* were alive to the advantages of a scene ending for additions and that they there applied the delayed-exit technique.

to the Roman audience, he was not one to pass by the opportunity to enlarge upon it.

This study has shown clearly the technique of the delayed exit. It was a natural and easy method, for the advantages of additions in such a position are obvious: the author need not join the end of the insertion to the resumption of the original—a task in which Plautus was neither skilled nor greatly interested. In support of the delayed exit as a conscious technique, it may be pointed out that the same advantages would exist, conversely, for expansions at scene beginnings and that Plautus has not overlooked these opportunities. This has been richly demonstrated by Fraenkel.

The technique was employed for two main purposes: the introduction of humorous material original with Plautus or expanded by him from the Greek and the introduction of material necessitated by changes in adaptation. Much of what has been cited is Plautine; there is undoubtedly more, but we are not so fortunate as to have proof. Yet our primary concern is not with the identification of separate items as Plautine but with the identification by means of these items, considered as a whole, of one specific Plautine technique which in turn adds to our general knowledge of his methods of adaptation.

NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

THE SACRED DOVES OF DELPHI

As Ion was about to partake of a banquet at Delphi, an ill-omened word from one of the servants caused him and the others present to cast upon the ground the libation which had been intended for the god.¹ He then ordered the sacred craters to be filled anew with wine of Byblos. At this moment the doves which dwelt in the halls of Apollo flew into the banquet tent and drank of the rejected libation. One of the birds reeled and fell dead of the poisoned wine which had been intended for Ion. The presence of doves in the Delphic sanctuary was not a figment of Euripides. The doves were still there a century later.² Both the choice and the sequence of words in the description of the scene are suggestive. A libation of *Βυβλίνου πώματος* (vs. 1195) brings to mind the Phoenician city of Byblos famous not only for its wine³ but for its temple of Aphrodite, who received the *epitheton* *Βυβλίη*.⁴ Doves were particularly sacred to her. When, therefore, the poet brings a flock of them swooping down into the banquet tent immediately after the mention of Bybline wine (1197), it is tempting to believe that he is alluding to the goddess of Byblos and her doves. In other words, the Delphic doves did not belong originally to Apollo but to Aphrodite, in whose temple at Paphos there was a flock.⁵

A second significant detail of the description is that the doves drank wine. For this reason the poet happily called them a *κῶμος πελειῶν* (1197) and enriched the Dionysiac flavor of the reference with the verb *ἐβάκχευσεν* (1204). That Euripides was not the first to give the dove a Dionysiac habit is shown by certain coins⁶ which have been assigned to Mallos in Cilicia, a Cretan

¹ Euripides *Ion* 1189 ff.; the god is Zeus Soter (cf. Van Herwerden, *Ion*, ad loc.).

² Diodorus xvi. 27.

³ Athenaeus i. 52.

⁴ Lucian *De dea Syria* 5.

⁵ For references to the dove in ancient literature see Steier in P.-W., *RE*, s.v. "Taube," p. 2497. So important was the dove in the cult that the name of Paphos, a great center of the worship of Aphrodite, is simply a variant of the word for dove, ἡ φάψ, τῆς φάβος. By metathesis of the aspirate, ἡ*φάβος became ἡ Πάφος. The same change occurred in the Cypriote word *φαφος*, as noted by Bechtel (*Griech. Dialekte*, I, 402). The dove on the coins of Paphos thus becomes a punning type.

⁶ G. F. Hill, *B.M. Cat. Coins, Lycaonia*, p. cxix, Pl. XVI, Nos. 1-4. For a Roman fresco of Bacchus clothed in a bunch of grapes see D.-S. *Dict. s.v.* "vinum," p. 922, Fig. 7516.

colony. On these coins which are dated between 485 and 425 appears a dove with a body formed of a bunch of grapes, while closely related types of the same city have only the bunch of grapes.⁷ This curious grape dove may be the rock dove called *oivás*—a word which means not only “dove” but “vine” and “wine.” Aristotle, the earliest author known to have used the word, derived it from *oĩvos* because of the wine-dark color of the dove.⁸ This derivation leaves out of account the bibulous propensities of the Delphic flock and the grape dove of Mallos where there was, as at Delphi, a most trustworthy oracle.⁹

The reputed interest of the dove in wine is, however, far older than the classical age of Greece. A wine cup discovered in the fourth shaft grave at Mycenae has a dove perched on either handle at the level of the rim. These two doves have been regarded as purely decorative, but the intention of the artist was rather that they are about to sip the wine in the cup. He could hardly wish to suggest that they are taking a bath in wine. That the two birds are doves is a safe conclusion from the Homeric description of the cup of Nestor.¹⁰ On either side of each of its four handles was a dove *πέλεια* which is always the wild dove in the Homeric poems.¹¹ The verb used of the doves is *νεμέθοντο*, which occurs only here in Homer. It has always been translated “were feeding,” although in Homer the shorter form of the same verb *νέμειν* was applied to the grazing and feeding of cattle. One cannot imagine doves feeding like cattle from Nestor’s wine cup but rather sipping its content. The verb *νεμέθοντο* is a passive to *νέμειν* in its meaning “to distribute.” The poet means to say that the doves were distributed about the rim of the cup, two to each of the four handles.

That the doves both of Nestor’s cup and of the cup from the shaft grave are Aphrodite’s is made highly probable by the presence in the third shaft grave of a significantly nude figurine in gold of the Phoenician goddess upon whom are perched three doves.¹² Even at this early date, the mid-second-millennium, the doves of Aphrodite were already addicted to wine in the

⁷ Cf. D’Arcy Thompson, *Glossary of Greek Birds*², p. 210.

⁸ Athenaeus 394a (cf. Steier, *loc. cit.*, p. 2486). Oppian (*Cyn.* iv. 235) uses *oivádes* of Bacchic women, hardly because of their color.

⁹ Pausanias i. 34. 2.

¹⁰ *Iliad* xi. 632 ff.

¹¹ Thompson, *op. cit.*, p. 225.

¹² For a golden dove upon a xoanon of Astarte at Hieropolis cf. Lucian *De dea Syria* 33. The comic poet Antiphanes may have had the doves of Aphrodite in mind when he represented a king of Paphos as anointing himself with a perfume made of a certain fruit (the grape?) which so attracted doves that they tried to perch on his head (Athenaeus vi. 257c). Slaves, however, repeatedly shooed them off, with the result that the royal head was kept cool by constant fanning with the wings of the birds. The Paphian king indoors had doves about his head just as did the Paphian queen Aphrodite. There was a male deity, Aphroditos, in Cyprus.

imagination of both the poet and the artist. The reason can have been only the importance of wine in the function of the goddess. The Minoan poet sang as did Anacreon:

μᾶλλον διδάσκει πίνειν
ἀπαλὸν πῶμα Λυαίου
μᾶλλον διδάσκει παίζειν
μετὰ χρυσῆς Ἀφροδίτης.¹³

That these Mycenaean doves were the progenitors in idea of the Delphic flock is very likely in view of the tradition that Apollo in seeking priests for his sanctuary at Delphi took the form of a dolphin and conducted to Crisa a ship containing Cretans from Minoan Cnossus.¹⁴ These Cretan mariners could have carried to Delphi the dove cult just as the Phoenicians took it to Sicily.

The wine-drinking doves bring Dionysus into the Delphic picture. How important Dionysus was at Delphi is shown by his appearance with the Thyiads in a gable of the great oracular temple there, while Apollo with his entourage appeared in the other.¹⁵ This conspicuous association with Apollo must have been in recognition of the wine-god's significance in the operation of the oracle. It is therefore highly probable that the water of the spring of Cassotis acquired its inspirational quality from a clandestine admixture of wine. The divine raving of the priestess of Apollo was then Dionysiac,¹⁶ and Euripides in calling the temple flock of doves a κῶμος was hinting at a secret of the sanctuary.

That divine intoxication appeared at the very beginning of the Apolline mantic cult is indicated by the traditions of the temple.¹⁷ The first temple at Delphi was built of laurel. The priestess of the god before prophesying chewed the leaves of the laurel and then drank of the sacred spring.¹⁸ Apollo took the temple of laurel to the Hyperboreans. His contact with the north may explain the appearance of bees as the builders of the second oracular temple of the god. With the bee came the intoxicating drink called "mead," which was fermented honey and water. It was the only intoxicating drink of the Indo-Germanic peoples.¹⁹ At some time in the northern cult of Apollo the honey of the bee must have served his oracular priestess as a means of

¹³ Preisendanz 52 and 12.

¹⁴ *Hym. Hom. ad Apoll.* 388 ff. Allen and Sikes on vs. 495 assume that there is no historical truth in the tradition of a Cretan origin for the cult of Apollo at Delphi. That the cult was northern does not preclude a borrowing of the dove from a Minoan-Mycenaean source.

¹⁵ Pausanias x. 19. 4 (cf. Frazer, *Pausanias*, V, 340).

¹⁶ The bearing of this on the sacred spring at Corinth will be discussed in another paper.

¹⁷ Pausanias x. 5. 9.

¹⁸ Cf. Frazer, *op. cit.*, p. 235.

¹⁹ Cf. Keller, *Antike Tierwelt*, II, 428.

producing the prophetic state. Later, when he came south into the land of the vine, the intoxicating medium became wine. There is perhaps evidence of the substitution of wine for honey in the fact that the northern word for intoxicating honey in the form of mead became a second Greek word for wine, μέθυ.²⁰ With each of the three intoxicating media—laurel leaf, honey, and wine—water was combined, unquestionably water from the sacred spring. The earliest medium, the laurel, has survived in recorded tradition; the other two are not mentioned. Yet the proposed interpretation offers a consistent explanation of the materials used in constructing the earliest mantic temples of Apollo at Delphi. The first temple was of laurel when the priestess used only the laurel as a means to prophetic exaltation. Bees furnished wax for the second temple because mead had become a means of inspiration. The birds whose feathers were combined with the wax were certainly doves. They brought the wine. That bees and doves (οἰβάδες?) conjointly contributed materials for the construction of the second temple indicates a period of transition when honey in the form of mead and wine were the intoxicating potions of the priestess.

There is no record that doves carried wine to Delphi, but that the motif appeared very early is shown by the tradition that doves carried ambrosia to Zeus. Homer alludes to it,²¹ and a later version of the story represented the doves as carrying ambrosia to the infant Zeus in the Dictaeon cave.²² There was in ancient times a difference of opinion as to the nature of ambrosia, which literally meant "immortality." For Homer the word had several meanings, perhaps due to the fact that it was in origin an adjective. Sappho used the word in the sense of "wine." In view of the interest of the dove in wine as revealed by the gold cup of the divine Mycenaean king, it is quite possible that in Minoan story doves carried to Zeus the wine of immortality. Zeus had a tomb in Crete. These doves that ministered unto the god bequeathed a title to his priestesses at Dodona.

G. W. ELDERKIN

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

THE HOMERIC CAVE ON ITHACA

The singular description in the *Odyssey*¹ of a cave on the island of Ithaca aroused the curiosity of Porphyry.² After considerable study of the passage he reached the conclusion that the poet intended the cave to be an image of the world in which souls descend into generation. It is difficult to believe that Homer had that intention because such symbolism is so completely foreign to the simplicity of his narrative. The cave therefore needs to be re-

²⁰ *Ibid.*

²¹ *Odyssey* xii. 60-62.

²² Athenaeus 491b.

¹ xiii. 95-112.

² *De antro nympharum.*

visited. It was a sanctuary of the nymphs and was located in the harbor of Phorkys, the old man of the sea. It contained craters and amphoras of stone in which bees deposited their honey and very tall looms, likewise of stone, on which the nymphs wove marvelous purple mantles. Finally, the cave had two doors: one pair to the north by which men descended and the other to the south which was "more divine." Hence the cave was frequented by both mortals and immortals.

The vessels of stone are significant, not because of their material, but because of their names and the purpose to which the vessels were put. They were craters and amphoras which Porphyry recognized as symbols of Dionysus³ when made of clay but as symbols of the nymphs of the waters when made of stone and most appropriate to nymphs presiding over water that issued from rock. The question as to why, then, the vessels were not filled with water instead of honey he could answer only by saying that the crater stood for a spring. But the crater was definitely Dionysiac and the amphora, too, when used for wine. The fact that these vessels were used for honey affords a clue to the significance of the cave.

In the absence of wine, the medium of intoxication was honey in the form of mead. When Zeus got Kronos drunk, he used honey because "wine was not yet."⁴ So when Homer represented the bees as depositing their honey in craters and amphoras—vessels which were later to receive the intoxicating wine—he was intimating that this honey was to serve the purpose of intoxication. This anticipatory use of the crater and the amphora was a poetical anachronism. Since the fermentation of honey required that it be mixed with water, the honey was logically placed in the crater which was later used for mixing wine with water. The amphora as a storage jar for wine could with equal appropriateness serve as a storage jar for the intoxicating honey.

Yet these stone vessels and the stone looms by themselves could have been explained as poetic fancy, the very tall looms suggested by closely parallel vertical stalactites⁵ in the cave, were it not for the two entrances which were strangely used, one for mortals and the other for immortals. Since these entrances are described each as *θύραι*, it is obvious that the poet has double doors in mind like those of a temple. The entrance to the north was for the descent of men, i.e., mortals. Nothing is said about their ascent. The southern entrance was the way of the immortals, their descent, as Porphyry notes, not being specified.⁶ The most likely explanation is that those who descended as mortals by the north portal emerged from the south as in some sense divine: *τὰ δὲ νότια οὐ θεῶν ἀλλὰ τῶν εἰς θεοὺς ἀνιουσῶν.*⁷ But how was this transformation accomplished? If the mortal who descended into the cave partook of intoxicating mead from the crater, was clothed in the robe woven by the

³ *Ibid.* 13.

⁴ *Ibid.* 16.

⁵ Cf. Herter in P.-W., *RE*, s.v. "Nymphaï," p. 1545.

⁶ *Op. cit.* 20.

⁷ *Ibid.* 23.

nymphs, and thus raised to the rank of the divine, emerged from the south entrance as an immortal, then all the seemingly unrelated details of the strange Homeric description present an essential unity of idea. The cave sanctuary of the nymphs was simply a place of initiation into sacred mysteries.

This explanation is not without confirmation from ancient mystic rites. Pythagoras descended into the Cretan cave where was the tomb of Zeus.⁸ It is the attractive theory of Cook⁹ that Pythagoras "sought to share the death and resurrection of Zeus"—in other words, that he descended into the cave as a mortal and came out a god. Further, Aristophanes¹⁰ represented the dead as saying "we would not lie thus crowned and anointed unless the moment we descended it were necessary to drink," alluding to the Orphic belief in drinking in paradise. Immortalization through intoxication with honey or with wine reminds one of the Vedic initiate who exclaimed, "We have drunk soma. We have become immortal. We have entered into light. We have known the gods."¹¹ That a robe played an important part in mystic rite is shown by the cult of Isis as described by Apuleius. Lucius, the initiate in a nocturnal ceremony, approached the limits of death, trod the threshold of Proserpina, and faced the deities of the lower world. The following day he was clad in a richly embroidered garment called by the priests "Olympic."¹² As a means of identification with deity, Lucius put on the garment of deity. Since the cave of the nymphs on Ithaca was situated on the harbor of the old man of the sea, Phorkys, it is possible that the nymphs were associated with him although they are here called naiads. If they clothed a mortal with a robe they had woven, they could then be compared with "the maids of the old man of the sea" who clothed the dead Achilles in immortal raiment:

κούραι ἀλίοιο γέροντος
περὶ δ' ἄμβροτα εἴματα ἔσσαν.¹³

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

G. W. ELDERKIN

THE NAME OF SARDIS

In the archaic Lydian language the year was called Sardis: *εἰσι δὲ οἱ φασι τῇ Λυδῶν ἀρχαίᾳ φωνῇ τὸν ἐνιαυτὸν καλεῖσθαι σάρδιν*. This prompted someone to observe that the numerical value of the letters of *Σάρδιν* is 365.¹ The coincidence is true of the Greek version of the name but not of the Lydian and hence cannot tell us why the name of a city should be the ancient

⁸ Cf. Cook, *Zeus*, II, 934.

⁹ *Ibid.*

¹⁰ Kock, *Com. Att. Frag.*, I, 517.

¹¹ Farnell, *Cults of the Greek States*, V, 122.

¹² *Metamorphoses* xi. 23.

¹³ *Odyssey* xxiv. 58-59.

¹ Io. Lydus *De mensibus* iii. 20.

Lydian word for "year." According to a tradition about Babylon which was current at least as early as the fourth century B.C.,² Semiramis had a wall built around the city which was 365 stades in circumference. A variant tradition credited to Ctesias the Cnidian gave the circuit of the wall as 360 stades. Semiramis desired that the number of stades be the same as the number of days in the year. A further detail of the tradition is that she assigned each stade of the wall to a friend with instructions to complete it within a year. Thus a circle of wall of 365 units in length was to be completed in a circle of time likewise consisting of 365 units. It is obvious that the wall was conceived in terms of a year. Now Lydus inferred that Sardis was named in honor of Helios and also states that the Lydians worshiped the year as a god. Apparently at both Sardis and Babylon the city wall was placed under the protection of the sun-god, the city in the former case being called "year" and in the latter having a "year-wall." Further evidence of the close association of the sun-god with Sardis is given by Herodotus,³ who records a pronouncement by the Telmessians that if Meles, a king of Sardis, carried all around the city's wall a lion which had been born to him by his concubine, Sardis would be impregnable. Meles, however, neglected to include a very steep part of the acropolis wall, and consequently the city fell into the hands of the Persians in the days of Croesus. The lion, as the ancient symbol of the strong victorious sun,⁴ was the protector of Sardis and for that reason was carried around the city wall. Sardis had also a "solar" wall.

Since a city wall came around to its starting-point and a year did likewise, ἀψ περιτελλομένου ἔτεος,⁵ the word for "circle" was descriptive of both. Such double significance is illustrated by the Greek κύκλος, which was used of a city wall, as in ὁ Ἀθηνέων κύκλος,⁶ and of a year or cycle of time, as in μύρια κύκλα ζῶειν.⁷ If the primary meaning of Sardis in Lydian was "circle," its semantic development is clear. It was applied to the circle of time, i.e., a year and to a circle of wall. From the meaning "circle" of wall the word came to designate what was within the circular wall, i.e., the city. Like the Greek ἔρκος, it signified not only the inclosing wall but what was contained within the wall. Since some settlements had more than one ring of wall, like Thessalian Dimeni, whose acropolis had six encircling walls,⁸ the city might be named in the plural, i.e., "the rings" instead of "the ring." Such may have been the origin of the plural forms of the names for Athens, Mycenae, and Sardeis.

This discussion raises a question as to the Greek word πόλις. Did it mean originally a surrounding wall and then the settlement within that wall?

² Diodorus ii. 7. 3; 8. 1.

³ i. 84.

⁴ Cf. Creuzer, *Symbolik und Mythologie*, II (1840), 633.

⁵ *Odysey* xi. 295.

⁶ Herodotus i. 98.

⁷ *Anth. Pal.*, VII, 575.

⁸ Tsuntas, II. 'A., p. 31.

If such was the semantic development, then πόλις, πόλις may be derived from πολέω, "to go around," and mean that which goes around a settlement, i.e., the encircling wall. Such sequence in meaning would approximate that of the Latin *ambitus* which meant first "a going round" and then "circle," "circumference," as in *ambitus parmae*. A closer parallel is offered by the city name Ἐρχομενός, which is the participle of ἔρχομαι with accent on the ultima as in δεξαμένη, for ἔρχομαι has the meaning "to come back," "to return." It is possible that Ἐλευσίς as a city name did not mean "arrival" but a settlement with a wall which went around it.

In the Lydian inscriptions discovered at Sardis are several words which are built upon *Sfard*.⁹ This is the Lydian name for Sardis from which the Persian occupants of the Lydian capitol derived Sparda,¹⁰ their name for the city. Lydian *Sfard* has been identified with Σπάρτη,¹¹ an identification the more welcome in view of the apparently early ties existing between Lydia and Sparta. A feature of the very old Spartan cult of Artemis Orthia was a πόμπη Ἀνδῶν, which is probably far older than Plutarch states.¹² The cult of Artemis at Sardis enjoyed great prestige, as may be inferred from her temple there and the frequent mention of her name in sepulchral inscriptions from the city's cemetery. The names *Sfard* and Sparta seem to be passive participial forms, while another name for Sardis Σνάρις (*Σνάρις? cf. ξύν and σύν) appears to be a noun. The pair Σνάρις, "circle," and *Sfard*, "circled," would then correspond to ἔρκος, "inclosure," and ἐρκτή, "inclosed." These names are to be compared with the Etruscan word for "city," *špur*.¹³ Another Lydian word for "year," appearing in the accusative as *borlū*,¹⁴ had probably a nominative *borlis*, the -lis being a common suffix in Lydian. Since Lydian *b* could appear in Greek as π,¹⁵ a substantive *por* may be posited and identified with περ-ί, "all around." In Lydian *borlū* then the idea of a year as a complete circle seems to be again in evidence.

G. W. ELDERKIN

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

LIVY'S PATAVINITAS

There is nobody nowadays who cares to explain the differences between Livy and the prose writers of the last century of the Republic as provincialisms due to his birth at Padua. Sober research on his language, conducted by

⁹ Buckler, *Lydian Inscriptions* (1924), pp. 41, 79.

¹⁰ Littmann, *Lydian Inscriptions* (1916), p. 12.

¹¹ Poisson, *Rev. arch.*, XXII (1925), 84.

¹² *Arist.* 17.

¹³ Cortsen, *Nord. tidssk. for filologi*, 1917, p. 172.

¹⁴ Buckler, *op. cit.*, p. 5, No. 2: *borlū* XIII, where the date is the fifteenth year of Artaxerxes.

¹⁵ Cf. Bartaras with Παπαπας in the bilingual from Pergamon (Buckler, *op. cit.*, p. 57).

Woelfflin,¹ Stacey,² and Riemann³ has provided us with better explanations of the peculiarities of his style. In this respect the question seems to be settled. But there is still the other problem, what Pollio meant by *Patavinitas* and how he got the idea of tracing back real or seeming offenses in the style of the most popular prose writer of his age to his origin in a city in the Po Valley. Years ago G. L. Hendrickson in a short paper⁴ explained the whole matter as a jest of Pollio. He did all that can be done to elucidate the subjective part of the matter—the moods of Pollio, who was one of the most critical and mischievous minds of his age. There can be no doubt that he is right. The only question left open is whether or not the peculiar form that Pollio's witticism took on this occasion can be connected with the literary habits of that time. That is what the present writer wishes to discuss.

It may be wise to start with an interpretation of the passage of Quintilian (viii. 1. 1), our unique source for the remark of Pollio. He is speaking of the qualities of style (*virtutes orationis*), which he gives according to a well-known Greek theory; the words have to be *Latina* ('Ελληνισμός), *perspicua* (σαφήνεια), *ornata* (κόσμος), *ad id quod efficere volumus accommodata* (πιθανότης). As far as the *Latinitas* is concerned, he refers to the grammatical discussion of the first book. In the present passage he wishes only to warn against expressions which might betray the foreigner; he gives two instances, the story of Theophrastus, whom a grocer in the market of Athens identified as non-Athenian by his pronunciation, and the case of Livy: "In T. Livio, mirae facundiae viro, putat inesse Pollio Asinius quandam Patavinitem" (viii. 1. 3). The first story is taken from the *Brutus* of Cicero (46. 172) where he discusses *urbanitas*, declining to give any definition of this quality. In *De oratore* (iii. 11. 40), he is more explicit:

Ut Latine loquamur non solum videndum est, ut et verba efferamus ea quae nemo iure reprehendat, et ut ea sic et casibus et temporibus et genere et numero conservemus, ut ne quid perturbatum ac discrepans aut praeposterum sit, sed etiam lingua et spiritus et vocis sonus est ipse moderandus.

As has been said, this whole theory is based on the Greek doctrine of Hellenism, which first appears in the third book of the Aristotelian *Rhetoric* (5. 1, 1407 a 19). The corresponding faults are solecism and barbarism (e.g., Auct. *ad Her.* iv. 12. 17). But apart from simple grammatical blunders, it was not easy to draw a line between these two and an intentional departure from the usual speech, the so-called *σχήματα λέξεως*; "quando soloecismus sit, quando schema, sola intelligentia discernit," says the elder Pliny (*Gramm. Lat.* v. 292. 13).

We gather from these well-known facts that Quintilian, at least, understood Pollio's words as referring to a lack of *Latinitas* and *urbanitas*. Now in

¹ Now repeated in his *Ausgewählte Schriften* (Leipzig, 1933), pp. 1 ff.

² *Arch. f. lat. Lex.*, X (1896), 17 ff.

³ *Etudes sur la langue et la grammaire de Tite Live* (2d ed.; 1884).

⁴ *Amer. Jour. Phil.*, XXXVI (1915), 70 ff.

dealing with the Greek theory of faults in this field we are faced with some puzzling statements of regional differences which hardly can have any foundation in the facts themselves. A few generations after Pollio the grammarian Heraclides from Miletus called the vulgar aorist forms of the type *ἔφαγα*, *ἔλαβα* Asiatic *ἡμάρτηται . . . καὶ Ἀσιανῆς ἔχεται φωνῆς καὶ οἱ Ἑλληνίζοντες δὲ ἐν Κιλικίᾳ οὕτω προφέρονται*.⁵ The forms are quite common over the whole area of Greek speech, and there was not the slightest reason to call them Asiatic rather than Egyptian or Syrian. One might say that Heraclides, born at Miletus, had the opportunity to observe this kind of vulgarism in his own country and therefore preferred to style it Asiatic; but this explanation does not account for the Cilicians, whom he quite correctly distinguishes from the Asians, as in his time they belonged to another province. There is no doubt that the Cilicians, who had such a bad reputation throughout antiquity, are quoted only to characterize the fault as a barbarian one. Better still, the perfect arbitrariness of these designations is shown by another instance. A contemporary of Pollio, the grammarian Philoxenus, called the use of *μή* instead of *οὐ* an *Ἀλαβανδιακὸς σολοικισμός* (Steph. Byz., p. 66, l. 17 [Meineke]). As I have shown elsewhere,⁶ it was the general trend of the Greek language to put *μή* in the place of *οὐ*—a trend already seen in the classic prose writers—and Alabanda as well as the rest of Greece took part in this evolution. Philoxenus was from Alexandria and taught in Rome (*Suid.*, s.v.); the idea of a grammarian of that period traveling for research and watching carefully the differences in the speech of the common people in different towns is quite absurd; therefore I suggested that behind this statement there might be some malice against the well-known rhetorical school of Alabanda led by Hierocles and Menocles, whose stylistic principles were opposed to those of Philoxenus, a strict Atticist. That the Atticists at that period made use of the Asian origin of most of their adversaries to call their style barbaric is shown by the title *κατὰ Φρυγῶν*, which one of the leaders of the movement, Caecilius, gave to one of his books (*Suid.*, s.v. *Καυκίλιος*; cf. von Wilamowitz, *Hermes*, XXXV [1900], 5); the Phrygians enjoyed no better reputation than the Cilicians, whose name in the fragment of Heraclides we have explained in the same way. A third instance is sponsored by a far more illustrious author. The scholia on Lycophron 252 quote the late forms *πέφρικαν*, *ἐσχάζσαν* as belonging to the dialect of Chalcis, obviously because they are used by Lycophron from Chalcis (*loc. cit.* and vs. 21). This statement goes back to Aristophanes of Byzantium, who in his book *περὶ ὑποπτευομένων μὴ εἰρῆσθαι τοῖς παλαιοῖς* blamed the poet for this vulgarism.⁷ Aristophanes might have heard the form

⁵ Eustath. *ad Hom.* 1759. 9; Heraclid. Miles., frag. 50 (Cohn) (Berlin, 1884).

⁶ *Herm.*, L (1915), 388; cf. L. Robert, *Etudes anatoliennes*, p. 435, n. 4.

⁷ Eustath. *ad Hom.* 1761. 37 ff.; Miller, *Mélanges de littérature grecque*, p. 428, n. 1; cf. Fresenius, *De Aἰξων Aristophanis excerptis Byzantinis* (Wiesbaden, 1875), p. 155.

As the excerpts in Miller's *Mélanges* omit the word *ἐσχάζσαν*, attempts have been made to eliminate the quotation, which is unwelcome to those who contest the author-

every day in Alexandria. He was one of the best experts in Greek dialects and certainly could not have seriously intended to ascribe the idiom specially to the Chalcidian dialect (cf. von Wilamowitz, *Hellenist. Dichtung*, II, 147, n. 1).

Somewhat puzzling is another case: the unusual construction of *χαίρω* with the accusative of the participle instead of the genitive is called "Oropian" (*Et. magn.* 808.3, from the *Genuinum*; see Miller, *Mél.*, p. 306). We cannot tell against whom this statement was directed, though it has no foundation in the real use of the dialect. Perhaps some joke of the Athenians, always inclined to mock at the speech of their neighbors, caused some grammarian to feel entitled to ascribe the use to the Oropians or perhaps a passage of a comedy induced him to do so. In any case, the fashion did not last very long. This is shown by a curious document, the treatise *περὶ σχημάτων* of Lesbos, a grammarian who seems to have lived in the second century A.D.⁸ He gives a long series of *σχήματα* with instances taken mostly from Homer, but each receives the name of a Greek people. No reason whatever can be seen for the different attributions. One gets the impression that somebody came across the ludicrous attributions we have dealt with without understanding their point and after this pattern invented a huge mass of names without any real knowledge of the Greek dialects, which no longer existed at that time.

In returning now to the jest of Pollio on the *Patavinitas* of Livy, we see that he simply made use of a Greek cliché. Again we are faced with Greek literary fashions which the Romans adopted with more or less success. When Pollio pretended to discover Patavian idioms in the style of Livy, everybody understood that he hinted at a lack of *urbanitas* or even *Latinitas*, but nobody expected any relation to the real speech at Padua any more than the readers of Philoxenus took his statements about Alabandian solecisms seriously. As on other occasions, Pollio was rather unsuccessful with his innovation. The Greek dialects had a literary life of their own and a long development; in Italy, Rome had conquered the whole country and the old dialects had dis-

ship of the *Alexandra*. They assume that either the quotation was an addition of Eustathius himself (in spite of his introductory words *παράδοσις δέ, sc. Aristophanes*) which Tzetzes in his scholia repeated afterward or did not refer to Lycophron at all but to some other author imitated in the *Alexandra*. Both possibilities can be excluded very neatly: (1) Several centuries before Eustathius and Tzetzes the scholium on the *Alexandra* was quoted by Choeroboscus (*Gramm. Graec.*, iv. 2. 64, 28 [Hilgard])—it is of no importance that our manuscripts of Choeroboscus have the usual Byzantine confusion between Chalcidonian, Chalcidian, and Carchedonian; (2) the whole note, including the quotation of the *Alexandra*, is given also by the so-called *Antiatticista*, a book of the second century A.D. (91. 14 [Bekker]), which in its main contents admittedly goes back to Aristophanes of Byzantium. It must stand as it is: the *Alexandra* is quoted as a poem of Lycophron by Aristophanes, whatever the consequence of this fact for the authorship of the *Alexandra* may be. Besides, it is not likely that the bishop of Saloniki on his own account invented a name which was meaningless in his own time but fitted in with the literary usage of about a thousand years earlier.

⁸ R. Mueller, *De Lesbos grammatico* (diss., Greifswald, 1890; reprinted at Leipzig, 1900).

appeared, leaving hardly any traces. There was no such thing as a special dialect of northern Italy; therefore Pollio, in transferring a form of Greek literary polemics to Rome, found no successor to discover, for example, elements of the language of Corduba in Seneca. Perhaps Seneca's adversary Quintilian was somewhat handicapped by his own Spanish origin. Isolated as it was, Pollio's remark, like so much in the literary life of Augustan times, could be understood only with the help of Greek parallels.

KURT LATTE

HAMBURG

FURTHER NOTES ON THE RITUAL OF THE BITHYNIAN CHRISTIANS

Recent discussions by Professor Kraemer and Professor Mohler¹ of Pliny's letter about the Christians (*Ep.* x. 96) have set forth the probability that the Decalogue was used in the service of the Bithynian church and have attempted an identification of the antiphonal hymn in praise of Christ which Pliny mentions with an element of the Jewish synagogue service. I should like to add a further suggestion on each of these points.

There is, as Professor Kraemer noted, some slight difficulty in fitting Pliny's summary of the oath taken by the Christians ("ne furta, ne latrocinia, ne adulteria committerent, ne fidem fallerent, ne depositum appellati abnegarent") into the framework of the Decalogue. Professor Kraemer himself sees in the first part of the quotation Pliny's version of "thou shalt not steal; thou shalt not kill; thou shalt not commit adultery," and in the latter part "a practical Roman's paraphrase of 'thou shalt not bear false witness; thou shalt not covet anything that is thy neighbor's,'" and he accounts for any changes of meaning by the "confusion of tongues" incidental to the translation of Greek court proceedings into Latin. No one would question the identity of the *furta* clause with the eighth commandment or of "ne adulteria committerent" with the seventh. "Ne latrocinia committerent" is fairly close to the meaning of the sixth commandment in the Greek phrasing of the Septuagint, οὐ φονεύσεις, for φονεύω regularly connotes violent death, and the Latin *latrocinia* covers the activities of the brigand who was capable of leaving his victim on the highway, not merely half dead, like the traveler on the road to Jericho, but altogether lifeless.² "Ne fidem fallerent" approximates οὐ

¹ Casper J. Kraemer, Jr., "Pliny and the Early Church Service," *Class. Phil.*, XXIX (1934), 293-300; S. L. Mohler, "The Bithynian Christians Again," *Class. Phil.*, XXX (1935), 167-69.

² Cf. the metaphorical application of the verb *latrocinari* to a vivisectionist in Celsus' *De medicina*, Proem 42, where, as the knife penetrates to the region about the heart, the victim's breathing stops: "ita mortui demum prae corda et viscus omne in conspectum latrocinantis medici dari utique necesse est tale, quale mortui sit, non quale vivi fuit."

ψευδομαρτυρήσεις, although the Greek refers specifically to lying testimony, whereas the broader Latin phrase fits any breaking of a solemn oath.³

"Ne depositum appellati abnegarent" presents more difficulties, and it is to this clause that I wish to give special attention. A close parallel to Pliny's phrase is to be found in the Gospel according to Mark (10:19), in the answer given by Jesus to the man who asked what he should do in order to inherit eternal life: μή φονεύσης, μή μοιχεύσης, μή κλέψης, μή ψευδομαρτυρήσης, μή ἀποστερήσης, τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ τὴν μητέρα. Commentators have noted that, unlike the rest of the commandments in this list, μή ἀποστερήσης does not occur in the Decalogue and that it is missing from the parallel accounts in Matthew and Luke and even from some manuscripts of Mark. As a rule, they connect the precept with Lev. 19:13 and Deut. 24:14 and apply it to the withholding of wages, remarking on the special appropriateness of the words as addressed to a man of wealth.⁴

Wages, however, were not the only rightful possession of another person that could be withheld. In the days before the existence of banks and safe-deposit boxes, leaving one's valuables with a trusted friend was the approved method of insuring their preservation.⁵ The possibility of wrongdoing in connection with such a deposit is recognized by the command in Lev. 6:2-5 that "if any one . . . commit a trespass against Jehovah, and deal falsely with his neighbor in a matter of deposit, . . . he shall restore . . . the deposit which was committed to him, . . . and shall add the fifth part more thereto," and lies at the base of the metaphor of I Tim. 6:20, "O Timothy, guard that which is committed unto thee."

Roman law put even more emphasis on deposits. The Laws of the Twelve Tables, according to Paulus, allowed a suit for double damages in the case of deposits,⁶ and later Roman law contained detailed provisions about such cases.⁷ Cicero (*De off.* i. 10. 31), in a discussion of cases where what would normally be a good action is really unjust, gives as an example "ut reddere

³ Cf. Cicero's statement about Regulus (*De off.* i. 13. 39): "ad supplicium redire maluit quam fidem hosti datam fallere," and similar phrases in Ovid *Amor.* iii. 3. 1 and *Heroid.* vii. 18.

⁴ E.g., B. H. Branscomb, *The Gospel of Mark* ("The Moffatt New Testament Commentary") (New York and London, n.d.), and *Das Markusevangelium*, ed. E. Klostermann ("Handbuch zum Neuen Testament") (Tübingen, 1926).

⁵ The custom continued through the Middle Ages; cf. the story told by Petrus Alphonsus (*Disc. cler.* xvi. 1-10) printed in K. P. Harrington's *Medieval Latin* (Boston, 1925), pp. 420-23.

⁶ C. G. Bruns, *Fontes iuris Romani antiqui* (Freiburg and Leipzig, 1893), p. 33, Table VIII. 19.

⁷ *Corpus iuris civilis: digesta*, ed. Th. Mommsen, rev. P. Krueger (Berlin, 1922) xvi. 3; see also the collection of passages in A. R. Crittenden, *Readings in Roman Law* (Antioch, Ohio, 1928), pp. 55-56, and the discussions in H. J. Roby, *Roman Private Law in the Times of Cicero and of the Antonines* (Cambridge, 1902), II, 94-97, and *Gaii institutiones*, ed. E. Poste, rev. E. A. Whittuck (Oxford, 1904), pp. 325-26.

depositum"; Quintilian speaks of the kind of defense that a man may make in certain cases, "ut in furtis, depositis, adulteriis" (*Inst. orat.* vii. 3. 1); and Juvenal bases his thirteenth satire on the situation of a certain Calvinus who is aflame with indignation, "sacrum . . . quod non reddat amicus depositum."

Both the Gospel of Mark, which was written for Western Christians,⁸ and the official report of Pliny as governor of Bithynia to the emperor Trajan reflect the Roman point of view. In the light of their phrasing and of the prominence of deposits in Roman law, it seems at least possible that some early Christians who had been under Roman influence included a clause about faithfulness in the restoration of deposits in their summary of the moral code.

As to the *carmen* of the Bithynian service, Pliny reports that the Christians had been accustomed "stato die ante lucem convenire carmenque Christo quasi deo dicere seum invicem." Professor Kraemer inclined to equate *carmen* with "psalm" and to conclude that in Pliny's time the antiphonal chanting of Old Testament psalms was a feature of Christian (and perhaps of Jewish) worship. Professor Mohler argued that the *carmen* was rather to be identified with an element of the Jewish service of which responses by the congregation formed an essential part—the same element to which the Decalogue itself belonged—namely, the Shema with its accompanying "Benedictions," and that the form of the Shema had been altered by Christianized Jews in such a way as to introduce the name of Christ at a certain point. Even this explanation, however, fails to bring out the full force of Pliny's words. Actually, the closest parallels to the song of the Bithynian Christians, both in its antiphonal character and in its praise of Christ as God, are to be found in certain passages of the New Testament where bits of early Christian hymnody have been preserved. The most striking of these, I Tim. 3:16 and Phil. 2:6–11, tell of Christ, who was "manifested in the flesh, . . . received up into glory"; who "emptied himself, taking the form of a servant," and to whom, after his humiliation, was given "the name which is above every name; that in the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven and things on earth and things under the earth, and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father":

I TIM. 3:16

- a) Ὃς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί,
ἐδικαιώθη ἐν πνεύματι,
ὥσθι ἀγγέλοις,
- b) ἐκηρύχθη ἐν ἔθνεσιν,
ἐπιστεύθη ἐν κόσμῳ,
ἀνελήμφθη ἐν δόξῃ.

⁸ Cf. B. W. Bacon, *Is Mark a Roman Gospel?* ("Harvard Theological Studies," VII [1919]); Branscomb, *op. cit.*, pp. xv–xviii.

PHIL. 2:6-11

- I. a) [Ὁ] ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων
οὐχ ἄρπαγμόν ἡγήσατο
τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ,
b) ἀλλὰ ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν
μορφὴν δούλου λαβὼν,
ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος⁹
c) καὶ σχήματι ἐθρεῖς ὡς ἄνθρωπος
ἐταπείνωσεν ἑαυτὸν
γενόμενος ὑπήκοος μέχρι θανάτου,
[θανάτου δὲ σταυροῦ.]
- II. a) διὸ καὶ ὁ θεὸς αὐτὸν ὑπερύψωσεν,
καὶ ἐχαρίσατο αὐτῷ
τὸ ὄνομα τὸ ὑπὲρ πάντων ὀνομα,
b) ἵνα ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ
πάντων γόνυ κάμψῃ
ἐπουρανίων καὶ ἐπιγείων καὶ καταχθονίων,
c) καὶ πάντα γλῶσσα ἐξομολογήσεται
ὅτι κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός
εἰς δόξαν Θεοῦ πατρὸς.

Here we have not only the praise of Christ but the expression of that praise in balanced phrases that are perfectly suited to antiphonal singing.⁹ We can therefore hardly doubt that it was in such words as these that the Bithynian Christians sang their hymn to Christ as God before daybreak on the first day of the week.

CORNELIA C. COULTER

MOUNT HOLYOKE COLLEGE
SOUTH HADLEY, MASSACHUSETTS

⁹ See the detailed analysis of Phil. 2:5-11 by E. Lohmeyer in "Kyrios Jesus" (*Sitzungsber. d. Heidelberg. Akad. d. Wiss., phil.-hist. Klasse* [1927-28], IV [Heidelberg, 1928]), which includes on p. 63 an analysis of I Tim. 3:16, and the briefer statement in the same author's commentary on the Epistle to the Philippians (in H. A. W. Meyer's *Kritisch-exegetische Kommentar über das Neue Testament*, IX [Göttingen, 1928]). Lohmeyer's conclusions are summarized and the passage printed in English in a form that shows the structure by A. B. Macdonald, *Christian Worship in the Primitive Church* (Edinburgh, 1934), pp. 118-20. I called attention to the passage from I Timothy in connection with Pliny's letter in an article on "Latin Hymns of the Middle Ages" in *Stud. in Phil.*, XXI (1924), 571-85, but it seems worth while to make the point again in the light of Lohmeyer's analysis of this passage and of his recognition of the passage in Philippians as a *carmen Christi*. The present quotation of the passage follows Lohmeyer in line division and strophic arrangement and also in changing δς of vs. 6 to ὁ and in bracketing θανάτου δὲ σταυροῦ as an explanatory phrase inserted by Paul.

TACITUS AND THE PORTRAITS OF GERMANICUS
AND DRUSUS

The passage in which Tacitus describes the posthumous honors paid to Germanicus is well known.¹ The sentence "statuarum locorumve in quis coleretur haud facile quis numerum inierit" has been cited particularly by students of portraiture to prove that in antiquity the portraits of Germanicus were set up in unusually large numbers.² But this sentence also reveals that Tacitus is not incapable of exaggeration in the interest of a favorite or, at best, of failure to distinguish between the portraits whose erection was immediately occasioned by the death of Germanicus and those erected both before his death and after—on the death of Drusus and during the reigns of Caligula and Claudius and, perhaps, even of Nero.³

The proof of this comes from the portrait inscriptions of Germanicus. Fifty-two of them are extant.⁴ This total clearly establishes that a large num-

¹ *Ann.* ii. 83.

² J. Bernoulli, *Römische Ikonographie*, II, Part I, 232; Bandinelli, *Römische Mitteilungen* (hereinafter referred to as *RM*), XLVII (1932), 156.

³ No portrait inscriptions of Germanicus that date from Nero's reign are known to me, but Germanicus is regularly named in the filiation of Nero's portrait inscriptions (*Corpus inscriptionum Latinarum* [hereinafter referred to as *CIL*], XI, 1331 = H. Dessau, *Inscriptiones Latinae selectae* [hereinafter referred to as *Dessau*], 233; *CIL*, XI, 1332, 6955 = Dessau 8902; *CIL*, II, 1392, 1281, 183 = Dessau 5640, 184; *CIL*, VII, 12 = *Ephemeris epigraphica* [hereinafter referred to as *EE*], IX, p. 513; *L'Année épigraphique* [hereinafter referred to as *Æ*], 1937, 52; *Inscriptiones Graecae* [hereinafter referred to as *IG*], V, 1, 1449, 1450; W. Dittenberger and K. Purgold, *Die Inschriften von Olympia* [hereinafter referred to as *Olympia 5*], 375; *CIL*, III, 382; *Inscriptiones Graecae ad res Romanas pertinentes* [hereinafter referred to as *IGR*], IV, 330).

⁴ *CIL*, VI, 909, 921b = Dessau 222, 923, 31205; XIV, 2794, 3942 = Dessau 173, 4340; X, 5050, 6649, 1415 = Dessau 177, 4572, 1198, 1625, 513 = Dessau 178; IX, 1106, 962; X, 460; IX, 2326; XI, 4776, 6952, 3306, 3308, 3786a; V, 4308, 6416 = Dessau 107; II, 2198, 2039, 1517, 3104; XIII, 1036; XII, 1846; *IG*, IX, 1^a, 724; II^a, 3255, 3258-60; V, 1, 375, 1411; *Olympia 5*, 372, 221 = W. Dittenberger, *Sylloge inscriptionum Graecarum*⁵ (hereinafter referred to as *Sylloge*⁵) 792; *IG*, XII, 3, 1393 = Dessau 8790a; *IGR*, IV, 979; *IG*, XII, 2, 540; *IGR*, IV, 326, 327, 1549, 723; *CIL*, III, 334 = Dessau 174; *Monumenta Asiae Minoris antiqua*, IV, 143; *IGR*, III, 715; *CIL*, III, 12047 = Dessau 175; *Æ*, 1933, 204. The following are doubtful: *CIL*, IX, 6295; XI, 6220, 3597; XII, 3158; XI, 6953; III, 426. The various portraits of Germanicus and Drusus referred to in the fragments (*CIL*, VI, 31199, 31200) of the inscriptions, cut in bronze, which record the honors voted them after their death are not included in the totals given for their portraits. In these fragments several different portraits of Drusus are mentioned, while the only phrases that certainly refer to portraits of Germanicus are *Caesaris pon . . .* and *imagines ponerentur supra*. The original number of portraits referred to in the decree must, however, have been about the same for both Germanicus and Drusus, though Tacitus says (*Ann.* iv. 9) that other honors besides those paid to Germanicus were voted Drusus. Since so much of the two decrees is lost, it seemed safer to exclude them both from consideration with the notation that in their extant form they augment the total of the portraits of Drusus rather than that of Germanicus.

ber of portraits existed in antiquity. But when it is compared with that of the portrait inscriptions of Tiberius or Claudius⁶ it becomes clear that "haud facile quis numerum inierit" is hyperbole, the extent of which is best realized by comparing the portrait inscriptions of Germanicus with those of Drusus the Younger and by analyzing the dates on which the portraits recorded by the extant inscriptions were set up.

A better criterion for testing the relative number of portraits of Germanicus than the portrait inscriptions of Drusus could scarcely be found. Drusus died only four years after Germanicus, like him an emperor's son, popular, and, since the death of his adopted brother, heir apparent to the throne. Unlike him he did not have a son and a brother who later became emperors and whose position renewed the attention paid to his memory. Yet forty-two portrait inscriptions of Drusus are extant,⁶ eighty per cent of the total number of the portrait inscriptions of Germanicus.⁷ Tacitus' cold words on the honors paid to Drusus' memory⁸ and his declaration that the senate and the people of Rome were secretly pleased with the revived prospects of Germanicus' family while feigning grief as Tiberius delivered the funeral oration for his son⁹ give no hint of so large a number or of the ratio between the portraits of the imperial brothers.

But the bias of Tacitus in favor of Germanicus is best seen when these totals are analyzed chronologically. Eleven of Germanicus' inscriptions are to be dated from A.D. 23—the date of Drusus' death—to A.D. 51/52, when a portrait of Germanicus recorded by two inscriptions¹⁰ was set up on the arch

⁶ The portrait inscriptions of Tiberius total approximately one hundred and twenty and those of Claudius one hundred and five (for Tiberius see my article to appear in *AJA*; and for Claudius see *ibid.*, and my study, *The Portraiture of Claudius* [New York, 1938], pp. 14–22). A further basis for comparison are the inscriptions of Caligula and Nero whose portraits were not respected after their death. Approximately seventeen portraits of Caligula and forty of Nero are recorded by inscriptions (see forthcoming article, *loc. cit.*). But even these figures do not justify Bernoulli's judgment: "Er [Germanicus] mochte in dieser Beziehung kaum hinter einem Kaiser zurückstehen [*op. cit.*, II, Part I, 232]."

⁶ *CIL*, VI, 910 = Dessau 168; XIV, 84, 2794, 5322; X, 3694, 4638, 4617, 4573; *Æ*, 1925, 94; *CIL*, IX, 35; XI, 4777, 3787, 3307, 7552; V, 4954, 2151 = Dessau 166, 5121, 6416 = Dessau 107; II, 1553, 2338, 2040, 5048, 3829 = Dessau 167, 3103; XIII, 1036; XII, 1847, 3157; XIII, 5199; XII, 147 = Dessau 169; III, 5769; *IG*, VII, 3103; II, 3256–57; *Olympia* 5, 372; *CIL*, III, 13565; *IGR*, IV, 930, 1549, 324, 1720; *CIG*, 2657; *IGR*, III, 895; *Æ*, 1933, 204. The following are doubtful: *CIL*, XI, 3597; II, 2821; IX, 6295.

⁷ Two of the portrait inscriptions of Germanicus apparently recorded the same portrait (*CIL*, VI 921b, 923). His portrait inscriptions are therefore evidence for only fifty-one portraits.

⁸ *Ann.* iv. 9: "memoriae Drusi eadem quae in Germanicum decernuntur, plerisque additis, ut ferme amat posterior adulatio."

⁹ *Ibid.* 12.

¹⁰ See n. 7.

of Claudius at Rome. The occasion for erecting these ten portraits was obviously not the death of Germanicus. The occasion that led to the erection of four of them¹¹ was clearly the death of Drusus. One was erected together with a portrait of Tiberius between A.D. 31 and 37.¹² Another was set up in the reign of Caligula at Thera.¹³ The others were erected in the reign of Claudius.¹⁴ Thus of the fifty-one portraits of Germanicus recorded by inscriptions only forty-one were set up before A.D. 23. The total number of Germanicus' inscriptions that record portraits erected during his lifetime and after his death until A.D. 23, the period that approximates that in which portraits of Drusus were set up, comes therefore to the same total number as that of the inscriptions of Drusus.¹⁵ Further analysis shows that the death of Germanicus was the occasion for the erection of twelve of these forty-one portraits,¹⁶ while the death of Drusus was the occasion for the erection of fourteen of his portraits.¹⁷ It is true that twelve of Germanicus' portrait inscriptions are undated,¹⁸ as compared with only seven undated inscriptions of Drusus.¹⁹ Since, however, all but four of Germanicus' undated inscriptions have been found in Greece or Asia Minor, it is most likely that at least some of these portraits were erected during his administration of the eastern provinces of the Empire.

Thus it is clear, I think, that there was no substantial difference in the number of portraits of Germanicus and Drusus whose erection was immediate-

¹¹ *CIL*, VI, 909, 910 = Dessau 176, 168; *CIL*, XI, 4776, 4777; XI, 3306, 3307; XII, 1846, 1847.

¹² *CIL*, XI, 3786.

¹³ *IG*, XII, 3, 1393 = Dessau 8790a.

¹⁴ *CIL*, VI, 921b-923, 31205; X, 1415; XIV, 2794. Bandinelli (*RM*, XLVII [1932], 157, n. 3) believes that the portraits of Germanicus received their widest distribution under Caligula, but this does not seem to be borne out by the inscriptions.

¹⁵ The portrait of Drusus set up between A.D. 50-54 (*CIL*, XIV, 2794) at Gabii has, of course, been excluded. It is barely possible that the portrait recorded by *CIL*, XI, 3787 was set up between A.D. 31-37 (see *CIL*, *ad loc.*).

¹⁶ I have listed as inscriptions recording portraits the erection of which was occasioned by the death of Germanicus all the inscriptions dated A.D. 18 by the mention of the second consulship and the second imperial salutation. It is of course possible that some of these portraits were erected long after his death as was the portrait set up jointly with one of Tiberius at Veii in A.D. 31-37 (*CIL*, XI, 3786a). But it is equally possible that some were erected before his death. I feel justified therefore in dating them all between A.D. 19 and 23 (*CIL*, XIV, 4340; X, 4572, 1198, 1625, 513 = Dessau 178; IX, 962; X, 460; IX, 2326; V, 4308; II, 2198, 2039, 1517).

¹⁷ Here again I am aware of inevitable uncertainties concerning the precise date in every instance: *CIL*, VI, 910 = Dessau 168; X, 4638; *Æ*, 1925, 94; *CIL*, IX, 35; XI, 4777, 3307; V, 4954; II, 2338, 2040; XII, 1847, 3157; XIII, 5199; XII, 147 = Dessau 169; *IG*, II², 3257.

¹⁸ *CIL*, X, 5050, 6649; IX, 1106; XI, 6952; *IG*, V, 1, 375, 1411; *IGR*, IV, 979; *IG*, XII, 2, 540; *IGR*, IV, 326, 327; III, 715; *Æ*, 1933, 204.

¹⁹ *CIL*, XIV, 84; X, 3694; XI, 3787; III, 5769; *IG*, VII, 3103; *IGR*, IV, 930; *Æ*, 1933, 204.

ly occasioned by their death. The differential of approximately twenty per cent in the number of their portraits when Tacitus wrote nearly a century later was the result of Germanicus' kinship with the three Julio-Claudian successors of Tiberius. The failure of Tacitus, whatever its cause, to distinguish between contemporary and later portraits of Germanicus has betrayed him into an exaggeration that has misled his readers to believe that Germanicus was made the object on his death of unparalleled iconographic tributes. To observe the consequences of this exaggeration one has only to compare the words of Bernoulli on the portraits of Drusus with those on the portraits of Germanicus.²⁰

HUNTER COLLEGE

MERIWETHER STUART

THE CHOICE OF ODYSSEUS (PLATO *REPUBLIC* 620 C-D)

The passage in the Vision of Er, which tells how the souls of the dead—famous men and women—chose in an order settled by lot the nature of their next life, ends with the choice of Odysseus. After long search he found the life of a private man without responsibilities lying neglected on one side, and, taking it gladly—for the remembrance of his past toils had cured him of all ambition—he said that he would have done the same even had his been the first choice. In most cases, says Er, the choice was made in conformity with the habits of a former life, and in fact we can see that the new life would have attractions for the chooser—the swan and the nightingale for Orpheus and Thamyris, the lion and the eagle for Ajax and Agamemnon, the ape for Ther-sites, the skilful workwoman for Epeus, and the athlete for Atalanta. But in the case of Odysseus the choice is *παρὰ προσδοκίαν*. Nothing in Homer or in extant tragedy prepares us for it. In the *Iliad* Odysseus is both warrior and diplomat, in the *Odyssey* he may indeed lament over his sufferings or shrink from the visit to Hades or long for a peaceful old age with Penelope but when told by Teiresias of his last task—the journey to a land where men do not know the sea—though he is “not pleased” (xxiii. 266) not even then does he wish for the life of an obscure man. Always he is Prince of Ithaca and conqueror of Troy, nearer to the Ulysses of Tennyson

How dull it is to pause, to make an end,
To rust unburnished, not to shine in use!

than to the Odysseus of the Vision of Er.

Plato has made inimitable use of the conception of a weary Odysseus; but, although we find no trace of it in extant tragedy, a lost play may have given him the first hint. We know from Dio Chrysostom (*Orat.* 52 and 59) that the *Philoctetes* of Euripides opened with a soliloquy by Odysseus in which he

²⁰ *Op. cit.*, II, Part I, 199, 232.

wonders whether the general opinion of his shrewdness and intelligence is not ill founded, for though he could live without pain and trouble he voluntarily spends his life in the midst of affairs and dangers. What kind of shrewdness and good sense is this—so runs the fuller paraphrase in Oration 59—which forces a man to labor more than all his fellows for the victory and safety of them all? In another sentence he declares that it is ambition (*φιλοτιμία*) which leads him to experience excessive troubles and to live a life of toil. Hence the lines

πῶς δ' αὖν φρονοῖν, ᾧ παρὴν ἀπραγμόνως
ἐν τοῖσι πολλοῖς, ἡριθμημένῳ στρατοῦ,
ἴσον μετασχεῖν τῷ σφωτάτῳ τύχης;

[Nauck, *Trag. Graec. Frag.*², Eur. 787]

are rightly assigned to the *Philoctetes*, although Plutarch (*Moralia* 544 C) cites them without name of play or poet and Aristotle (*Eth. Nic.* 1142 a 3) merely as from Euripides.

In the play these doubts and self-criticisms are a dramatic device to heighten the interest of the audience in the new and dangerous task—the appeasing of Philoctetes—which will test all the resources of πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεύς. But the phrases ἐξὸν . . . ἀλύπως καὶ ἀπραγμόνως ζῆν (Orat. 52. 12) and πλείω τῶν ἄλλων πονεῖν . . . ὑφ' ἧς φιλοτιμίας κάγώ προάγομαι . . . ζῆν ἐπιπόνως (Orat. 59. 1 f.) are near to those of Plato, whose Odysseus μνήμη τῶν προτέρων πόνων has abandoned all ambition (*φιλοτιμία*) and seeks for the life ἀνδρὸς ἀπράγμονος.

MARGARET E. HIRST

UNIVERSITY OF BIRMINGHAM
ENGLAND

INDEX VERBORUM TO ISAEUS

The following communication has been received by one of the editors:

A verbal index to the speeches of Isaeus is appearing by instalments in *Hermathena*, the journal of Trinity College, Dublin, Ireland, which is published twice yearly (May and November). The index is the work of Dr. W. A. Goligher, Regius Professor of Greek in Dublin University. It aims at giving the references to all the places in which any word occurs, with a few exceptions, such as *ὁ* and *καί*, together with notes on the meaning and usage in Isaeus and the other orators, where these present points of interest. The first instalment appeared in No. LI (price, 6/-), the second and third in Nos. LII and LIII (price 3/- each, for these and future numbers). Orders should be addressed to the Publishers (Hodges, Figgis & Co., 20 Nassau Street, Dublin; Longmans, Green & Co., Ltd., 39 Paternoster Row, London).

Reprints are not available, and the work can be secured only by purchasing the numbers of *Hermathena* in which it appears.

BOOK REVIEWS

The History of the Greek and Roman Theater. By MARGARETE BIEBER.
Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1939. Pp. viii+467+566 figs.
\$7.50.

Dr. Bieber, formerly at Giessen University but now at Barnard College, has been long and favorably known for her scholarly writings, notably for her *Denkmäler zum Theaterwesen im Altertum* (1920), of which the present work is in effect an expansion and translation. Though there is considerable duplication in text and illustrations, there is also much that is new and brought up to date, especially since the whole plan has been altered: the older volume consisted essentially of a series of cuts and plates with appropriate commentary, while the present text is continuous with interpolated illustrations. This difference remains true despite the author's explanation of her purpose in the Preface.

She thinks (p. vii) that "a number of handbooks, such as those by Müller, Oehmichen, Navarre, Flickinger, and Allen, give a systematic survey of theatrical antiquities, including monuments, but with the chief emphasis on the philological and literary side. The monuments have often been pushed into second place, merely as illustrations. . . ." In her *Denkmäler* she "attempted to demonstrate how indispensable are the hitherto neglected figured monumental sources, . . . which are objective and contemporary, in contrast to the literary sources, which are for the most part subjective opinions of individuals, and often of late writers." The present volume is "An attempt to make a synthesis, to construct out of the various elements a connected whole, a history of the theater in the ancient world." Though I would not challenge this point of view, nevertheless it should be pointed out that her predecessors did not have at their disposal the broad canvas which Miss Bieber has twice had. Even in *Denkmäler* she had 212 pages of large format (10 $\frac{1}{4}$ " \times 8") for text and cuts, plus over a hundred pages for plates. The aggregate of pages for her *History* is more numerous by 50 per cent, and they are almost as large in format. Such works are expensive, but the *History* enjoyed subventions from the Council of Learned Societies, the Council of Research in Humanities, and the American Association of University Women. Without such help Dr. Bieber's predecessors had to accommodate themselves to the means accorded them by their publishers, however generous, and naturally included what they considered most important, reducing expensive illustrations to measure. In spite of everything the author herself has had to adopt a similar policy and announces (p. viii) that "the most important lit-

erary evidence will be collected in a small supplementary volume." What, then, becomes of the synthesis?

The *History* opens so simply that one might well suppose it to be written for a popular audience:

The performance of a Greek tragedy in our time is apt to make a markedly deep impression on an educated audience. It may almost be described as miraculous that the works of Aeschylus, Sophokles, and Euripides, belonging as they do to the very beginning of the development of drama, in the fifth century B.C., should be works of art so lofty as to retain their power to exalt and to terrify even today. . . . The drama is the latest of the three most important literary forms, Epic, Lyric, and Drama, created by the Greeks and still alive today. The earliest is the epic, represented for the Greeks, as for ourselves, by Homer. An artist of the Hellenistic age (Archelaos) in a relief called the "Apotheosis of Homer" (Fig. 1), well expressed the view that from Homer all other forms derive.¹

This is certainly an example of "beginning distantly [if not doubtfully] and far away" and of explaining everything as one goes along, but in fact this style is not long retained. Actually the work is intended for specialists, who alone could understand much of it or be inclined to buy so costly a volume. This tendency increases as we move through the book, which becomes ever more sketchy and allusive. It seems as if the author did not realize at first that even for a book of nearly five hundred pages one has to pick and choose, and then was constrained to hurry toward the end. In truth there is nowhere published an adequate account of the Roman theater. The magnificent structures of the Empire lack the sentimental value of being contemporaneous with great Latin plays or even strongly associated in our memories with Greek drama. In consequence they are usually hurried through as an afterthought or a necessary evil in a few paragraphs or pages at the end of a longer treatment of something regarded as more important. Miss Bieber's book also gives this impression.

Before proceeding I wish to call attention to the Latin spelling "Aeschylus" in the above quotation in juxtaposition with the Greek spellings "Sophokles" and "Archelaos." The same inconsistency occurs again and again throughout the volume, even in the same word or phrase; cf., e.g., "Choirilus" (p. 32), "Peisistratus" (p. 38), "Oiniadae" (pp. 237 f.), "Ekklesiazousae" (pp. 267 f.), "Menaichmi" (p. 350), "Polybios apud Athenaeus" (p. 326 n.; but contrast "Athenaios" on p. 342, n. 17), etc. Similarly one finds "story" on page 353, note 29, but usually "storey"; "cothurnus" on page 393 but usually "kothurnos" (why not "kothornos"?); "odeum" (twice) on page 381, note 34, but usually "odeion"; "Sant' Agata" on page 268, note 30, but "Sanct' Agata" under Figure 364; and "nekropolis" on page 408 and under Figure 531 contrary to American usage. Pausanias is misspelled on page 41,

¹ The same impression is conveyed by references to *Amphitryon* 38 (p. 204, n. 72), Mussolini (p. 315, n. 2), and Rin-tin-tin, the canine star of the moving pictures! (p. 422) in an attempt to bring the ancient theater right down to the minute.

Pratinas on page 101, *ὑποκριτής* on page 149, and *secundarum partium* on page 323. Professor Miller's initials are wrongly given on page 404, note 20. Moreover, titles of ancient writings are indifferently indicated by the use of italics, plain roman, or quotation marks; thus on page 307 appear "Varro, L.L.," "Tacitus *Ann.*," and "Asinaria." Similarly contrast "Suetonius (Divus Julius, 39, and Nero, 12)" on pages 338 f. with "Suetonius *Augustus*, 29" on page 347, note 20, and "Suetonius, *Nero XXV*" on page 403, etc. Again, on page 355, note 46, "cf." and "cf." appear in adjoining lines. I confess I do not see the sense of spelling "cf." with lower case initial at the beginning of a footnote. I have recently noticed this elsewhere, and it is regularly done here. Latin words or short phrases are usually italicized, but not here. Though volume and year are usually given in references to periodicals, "ff." (why italicized?) is irritatingly used again and again to denote an indefinite number of pages. Of course the proofreaders of the Princeton University Press are to be held responsible for most of the things mentioned in this paragraph.

The relationship between the text and the illustrations, also, is not always all that it should be. Figure 1, cited in the above quotation, shows only the lowest scene on the Archelaus relief, but (to those unacquainted with Greek art) that fact would not be known from either the text or the footnote. It is mentioned on page 4, note 4, with further discussion on page 252, note 84. The full significance of Figure 242 (on p. 179) can hardly be seen without Figure 343 (p. 247) but there is no cross-reference; and note 75, which explains Figure 343 (p. 247), stands on page 251. Figure 290 (on p. 205) is discussed on page 253 and note 85. Figure 225 (on p. 168) deserves a cross-reference to page 320 and Figure 425. There are numerous other instances of similar failure to correlate material.

But I must move on to more important matters, though it is obviously impossible to discuss many details when controversy lurks on almost every page. In general, Miss Bieber's positions are marked by conservatism and caution. Thus she rejects a raised stage in the classical age (pp. 139 and 224) and considers "no device better attested as belonging to the fifth century than the *ekkyklema* . . . and none more important for the mise en scène of Euripides' tragedies" (p. 144), though it is wrong to cite Bethe's *Prolegomena* in support of this view since he has now altered his position (cf. *Rhein. Mus.*, LXXXIII [1934], 32-38). As to this matter and the appearance of Clytemnaestra's ghost in *Eumenides* (p. 148) I have recently published a slight modification of my previous interpretation in *Class. Jour.*, XXXIV (1939), 355-60. It will be a shock and disappointment to the young American scholar who pontifically wrote that "The 'Rule of Three Actors' is dead but doesn't know enough to lie down" (*Amer. Jour. Phil.*, LVI [1935], 273), to find that Dr. Bieber (p. 151) still believes in it! In this connection it is too bad that she could not have cited (on p. 150) Professor Todd's paper in *Class. Quart.*,

XXXII (1938), 30-38, entitled "Τριταγωνιστής: A Reconsideration," or (p. 327) Beare's "Seats in the Greek and Roman Theatres," *Class. Rev.*, LIII (1939), 51-55. On the use of the μηχανή and the staging of Aristophanes' *Peace* there might have been a reference to my article in *Mélanges Navarre*, 1935, pages 191-206. In her discussion (p. 18) of Aeschylus, *Frag.* 207, I miss a reference to Professor Shorey's interpretation (cited in my *Greek Theater*, p. 30, n. 3), and to Maidment's "The Later Comic Chorus" (*Class. Quart.*, XXIX [1935], 1-24) on page 163, note 2. She overworks parallels from the Bali theater (pp. 24, 45, 68, 113) but wisely rejects (p. 222, n. 25) Allen's theory concerning the early significance of the προσκήνιον. I could hardly believe my eyes when I read Dr. Bieber's statement (p. 65) that a chorus of frogs in Aristophanes' play "disappeared altogether when once the audience has been amused by . . . their grotesque hops around the boat of Charon," and my amazement increased when I came to her reference (p. 139, n. 34), seemingly with approval, to my interpretation of this play. Of course these "frogs" were heard but not seen. Especially interesting is her conviction (p. 204) that the Terence miniatures originated in the fourth century A.D. and "show the continuation of a living tradition until the very end of antiquity" and (p. 397) that the tragedies of Seneca were actually presented on the stage.

Miss Bieber sometimes ignores or glosses over troublesome points. For example, she makes no attempt to explain (pp. 16 and 22) how the caprine Doric satyrs acquired some of the physical characteristics of the Attic equine silenoi when they passed into the theater, and devotes only one sentence (p. 141) to the conventional significance of the πάροδοι, for which she should have referred to Fensterbusch in *Philologus*, LXXXI (1925), 480-83, and Warnecke, *Philologus*, XXXIV (1928), 118 f., and now to Beare in *Class. Quart.*, XXXII (1938), 205-10. And, unless I am mistaken, she has not a single word concerning the *angiportum*, so important for understanding the staging of some of the Roman comedies, for which reference may now be made to Beare in *Hermathena*, LIII (1939), 88-99. Her references to the form of the Nero theater at Athens, also, are inadequate and noncommittal (cf. Index), and her brief reference to drop curtains on page 354 leaves many questions unanswered. Moreover, what Dr. Bieber writes on pages 372-79 concerning Greco-Roman theaters would not be acceptable to many scholars, certainly not to Dörpfeld and his followers. The author herself seems to have been conscious of this inadequacy and immediately added two paragraphs on this subject contributed by Professor Friend of Princeton (cf. pp. 379-81 and n. 24).

Sometimes Dr. Bieber seems to me to be too dogmatic, as when she states (p. 269) that Plautus "must" have been influenced by native farce, and finds "proof" of this assumption in the Assteas vase (p. 277). I feel, also, that she reads too much into ancient representations whose very outlines are often quite obscure, let alone their precise interpretation. A similar mistake is made

in claiming practically every vase painting or fresco whereon caprine creatures appear as a scene from a satyr play. It is not always certain that the figures are satyrs, let alone engaged in a satyr play. But of course in such procedures Miss Bieber errs, if it is an error, in a numerous company. I am not so much concerned in denying the validity of such interpretations as in protesting the use of the results as if there were no doubt of their correctness. In addition to numerous bibliographical references in the footnotes there is a short selected bibliography, most of the items being German. Despite its length, the Index (pp. 455-65) falls short at many points. There is no Index Locorum.

Though Professor Bieber's *Denkmäler* was monumental and invaluable to workers in the field of scenic antiquities, the present volume, in spite of any possible criticism that can be leveled against it, marks a big improvement over the earlier one. I can think of no higher praise.

ROY C. FLICKINGER

University of Iowa

Wirtschaftsgeschichte des Altertums. By FRITZ M. HEICHELHEIM. 2 vols. gr. 8vo. Leiden: A. W. Sijthoff's Uitgeversmaatschappij N. V., 1938. Pp. 862+377. Fl. 49; bound, Fl. 52.

This is an extremely important book. The author, known from his previous works as a keen-minded and prolific student of ancient economic history, has now covered in the compass of a single work the economic aspects of pre-history and of history proper from Adam to Islam. It is the first time that this feat has been attempted in detail for the ancient world, for earlier general economic histories, like that of Laum, have dealt with world-developments; the space there allotted, in consequence, to classical antiquity is relatively small and the treatment perforce cursory.

The writer divides his field into eight chapters or rather sections. After a brief introduction (pp. 1-11), he describes the "Hunter and Gleaner Culture of the Palaeolithic Period" (pp. 12-32); and the "Coming of Plant-cultivation, Cattle-raising and of the Peasantry" (i.e., the neolithic and aeneolithic cultures [pp. 33-105]). He then discusses the "City Cultures of the Ancient Orient"—Egypt, Babylonia, Iran, and the Indus Valley, Anatolia and the Hittites, down to the second barbarian invasion of ca. 1200 B.C. (pp. 106-98)—and continues with a chapter on the "Ancient Mediterranean Culture, Its Beginning in the Early Iron Age and Its First Interaction with the Ancient East (1160-560 B.C.)" (pp. 199-293). Next he treats the "Classical Period of Polis Economy from Peisistratos to Alexander" (pp. 294-419), "Alexander to Caesar" (pp. 420-676), "Augustus to Diocletian" (pp. 677-765) and "Late Antiquity from Diocletian to Heraclius as the Preserver of Ancient Civilization for the Future" (pp. 766-848), closing the book with a final résumé of the economic level of the Ancient Mediterranean culture of the Iron Age

(pp. 848-59). The second volume comprises the notes to the nine chapters of the text and a topical index (pp. 863-1239).

There can be no doubt that Heichelheim's work marks a great general advance in our economic understanding of ancient culture. The existent modern literature, which is as scattered as it is enormous, has been sifted, the literary sources for the Greek and Roman periods have been culled at first hand. Oriental sources are used where available in translation, extract, or treatment. In addition the archaeological material has been widely drawn upon, the papyri and inscriptions have been carefully studied, and, last but not least, philological materials are utilized intensively. The voluminous notes back up the writer's statements or support his deductions and afford an invaluable bibliographical aid for those who wish to investigate individual problems on their own. An unrivaled general picture is the result, while many interesting observations and striking parallels with other eras, including our own, stand out from the author's presentation.

The individual chapters follow analogous schemata in the treatment of material, with certain variations imposed by its character. Money and capital, commerce, banking, transportation, war, industry and crafts, basic production, and the organization of the state from an economic viewpoint are the main topics touched upon. From the angle of economic theory Heichelheim follows the categories of W. Spiethoff and Max Weber. He defines economy (= *Wirtschaft*, p. 4) as "das zweckrationale und dynamische Spannungsverhältniss zwischen den drei grossen Wirtschaftsfactoren Boden, Arbeit und Kapital," and his discussion does in fact always involve one of these three factors.

The reviewer does not feel himself competent to give a reasoned judgment on all sections of the book; this is particularly true of those parts which deal with primitive culture. The writer emphasizes the revolutionary break which occurred when agricultural organization replaced hunting economy at the end of the Palaeolithic period, the shift in economic importance in the relative position of the sexes which ensued, and the appearance of reserve foodstocks, which Heichelheim considers, rightly I think, as a primitive form of capital. He also points out that a long period of "peasant" economy must have supervened before cities could appear and that many of the inventions and improvements in human life ordinarily attributed to city politics must have arisen at the peasant level. The reviewer still remains rather skeptical as to the dating of the period, despite the seemingly solid results attained by the geologists and palaeobotanists in the analysis of pollen and the counting of clay varves. Synchronism in the historically dated remains is difficult to establish even with this new technique.

His chapter on the ancient Orient gives rise to more doubts. Egypt and Babylonia are treated together, a line of approach which emphasizes the likeness between them but tends also to obscure their fundamental differences. We can grant with Heichelheim that the *Königsoikos* (the term smacks un-

pleasantly of Bücher's theorizing) with its far-flung and co-ordinated activities, was fundamentally akin in both states, but by insisting on this kinship he fails to bring out the equally fundamental variation in both areas. Babylonia was an aggregation of city-states, amorphous at times and then temporarily united under the military hegemony of a capable ruler. Egypt was an agglomeration of cantons, at first independent and later generally united under a central authority, while the centers of population were far from being cities in the Babylonian sense of the term. Babylonian cities were marts, and the surrounding hill-and-desert tribes were in an intimate interdependent nexus with the city dwellers. Egypt was far more self-sufficient. So, too, the agricultural problems of the two states differed more than appears at first sight—a matter of the levee versus the irrigation canal.

Heichelheim places the end of the dominance of the old Oriental totalitarian states at the barbarian invasion of the year 1200 B.C. and as the basic cause in their decline fixes upon the discovery and utilization of iron by the northern nations (p. 208). This seems to the reviewer an exaggeration. According to the author, this discovery made the forest areas much more independent than under the bronze culture, as iron is much more widely disseminated in nature than copper and tin. True, iron is more common, but the metallurgical difficulties involved under primitive conditions in smelting and reducing the metal from different types of ore and in treating it thereafter are very considerable and were by no means overcome in the early stages or even much later (cf. Polyb. ii. 33 on the Gallic swords). To ascribe to this the superiority of the barbarian invaders of 1200 B.C. over the civilized states seems an unlikely assumption. It is rather another instance of the phenomenon, examples of which abound in history, that a disciplined, well-led horde of nomads will overthrow the armies of a more highly civilized state.

The reviewer feels that particular attention should be called to the careful utilization of coin-ward statistics during the period of Greek economic dominance. This type of material has been widely employed by historians of the Empire but has been somewhat neglected by those of classical Greece. The chief emphasis is laid by Heichelheim on the Hellenistic period, where the author's previous studies especially fit him to give an intensive treatment. In his discussion of the causes of the collapse of the Hellenistic states, he takes up an intermediate position between Rostovtzeff and Kahrstedt, but if I read him correctly, he leans more to the side of the latter scholar in stressing the baneful effect of the Roman conquest and considers the wars of the Hellenistic *basileis*, internecine and foreign, to have been less important.

His attitude toward Rome in general is distinctly unsympathetic, and he emphasizes continually the decline in economic elaboration observable when the imperial organization is compared to that of Ptolemaic Egypt. Ptolemaic administration was definitely exploitative, highly centralized, and very effective for a time, it is true, but the system in large measure collapsed from its own weight before the close of the third century B.C. Roman imperial

provincial administration may well have been less systematized, more eclectic, and patchy in its structure, but its functioning, it would seem, offered the inhabitants of the Empire an efficient and agreeable rule over a huge territory for twice the period that the Ptolemies functioned effectually. This same penchant for things Hellenistic leads Heichelheim to exalt Julius Caesar at Octavian's expense.

In the treatment of the Roman Empire the reviewer misses particularly a clear statement of the change in economic policy of the Iranian state caused by the advent of the Sassanids, the conquest of Mesene and Characene, and its repercussions in the caravan cities. So, too, the estimate of the loss of gold under the later Empire seems too high. Gold production within the Empire had declined, but the supply from abroad did not cease. It should also be noted that the trade with the Orient under the later Empire was not as unbalanced as Heichelheim assumes. Large quantities of woven silk were exported to Persia, and the prevalence of oriental motifs in the Roman silks can be attributed in large measure to this export activity. The craftsmanship of the Iranian weavers seems to have been definitely inferior to those of Syria, as the transplantation and treatment of the population of Antioch both by Šapur and by Khosroes shows.

Finally I should hesitate to say that under Heraclius began the "reform" which re-established a free peasantry in Anatolia (p. 829). The ravages of the Persian troops wiped out the big estates and militarized (resp. barbarized) the population, as Stein has shown. Heraclius made what he could out of the devastated plateau.

The notes are very extensive and form an exceedingly valuable part of the book. Full references are given to the articles in the various encyclopaedias (Pauly-Wissowa, Daremberg et Saglio, Ebert, etc.). This is especially helpful for Pauly-Wissowa, where valuable dissertations have a habit of getting buried in the *Supplementbänder*; it should be noted, however, that Band I of Pauly-Wissowa goes back to the early nineties and Volume I of Daremberg et Saglio to the seventies, nor is the quality of the articles uniform. A few critical notes on important books appear here and there, but more would have been desirable. The writer has a tendency to cite only the most modern material and perhaps to neglect older but still valuable contributions. The utilization of the Bibliography by other scholars would have been much facilitated had the author given us a classified list of titles in alphabetical order and confined his *renvois* to abbreviated references, a procedure which would, I think, have measurably diminished the volume of pages.

The foregoing strictures must not be taken as reflecting upon the fundamental value of the book; they represent differences of opinion or lacunae which are inevitable in a general work of this scope. The book will long remain the basic work in this field.

ROBERT P. BLAKE

Harvard University

Demosthenes: The Origin and Growth of His Policy. By WERNER JAEGER.
Berkeley: University of California Press, 1938. Pp. x+273.

The present work, which constitutes the thirteenth volume of the Sather Classical Lectures, presents a systematic attempt to trace the origin and development of Demosthenes' political policy. In the opening pages of chapter i Professor Jaeger questions sharply and, the present reviewer believes, justly, the view so widely held during the nineteenth century, that Demosthenes, historically speaking, was little more than a petty and annoying obstacle to the triumphant progress of Pan-Hellenism. He then describes the political environment in which Demosthenes' early years were spent, and the changes that came over Athenian and Greek life from the end of the Peloponnesian War to the Peace of Sparta in 371 B.C. In chapter ii the author narrates how the young Demosthenes struggled to regain his patrimony; how this struggle and his victory over his defects of utterance revealed, if they did not develop, his astounding tenacity of will; how from this litigation his career as lawyer and as writer of speeches really began; and how his skill in legal argument led ultimately to his employment "in private suits where huge sums were involved." Chapter iii is entitled "The Turn to Politics." Here we are shown the transitional phase of his career. In the speeches "Against Androtion," "Against Timocrates," and "Against Leptines" the legal issues concerned the financial policy of the then administration. Demosthenes supported the views of the opposition which was led by Eubulus. Thus we learn that Demosthenes, in Jaeger's words, "began his career, if not as an immediate partisan of Eubulus, at least as a fighter against the same opponents."

In the remaining five chapters of the book Jaeger considers the development of Demosthenes' more specifically political thought. In chapter iv three orations are studied. In the speech "On the Symmories" Demosthenes, still supporting the policy of Eubulus, advocated a new financial scheme to serve as the basis of expanded armaments. The oration "For the Megalopolitans" advanced, as against sentimental notions, the Machiavellian argument that Athens should consider solely the interest of Athens and that that interest required Athens to favor the cause of Arcadia and Messenia against Sparta. In the speech "On the Freedom of the Rhodians" Demosthenes urged that Athens should welcome and support the exiled democrats from Rhodes, not from motives of abstract sympathy but from the realistic conviction that in this way Athens might escape "from the stagnation of foreign politics." By the speech Demosthenes seems to have broken with the party of Eubulus. He has moved forward toward the position from which he later attacked Philip of Macedon.

Chapter v presents the early details of this development. The oration "Against Aristocrates" was written to be delivered against a bill providing that special privileges should be extended to Charidemus, brother-in-law of Cersobleptes. Demosthenes probably believed that it was to Athens' interest to strengthen the power of Amadocus, brother and rival of Cersobleptes. For

thus, he mistakenly held, the advance of Philip could be checked. In the First Philippic, which was called forth by the advance of Philip to the Hellespont, Demosthenes advocated a new military establishment which would more effectively check further aggressions. The speech was "an attempt to take a forceful initiative in the Macedonian policy." Chapter vi discusses the three Olynthiac speeches. In the first Demosthenes maintained that the fitting moment had arrived to strike at Philip while he was ill. In the Second Olynthiac he urged the alienation of the Thessalians from their support of Philip. Moreover, in order to bring effective help to Olynthus, he proposed a "bold and revolutionary measure": the discontinuation of the *theorica*. The suggestion was a direct attack upon the leadership of Eubulus. The Third Olynthiac marked a still further step away from the policies of the well-to-do classes in Athens. Demosthenes in this speech resolved to appeal "to the people as the highest tribunal," not because of an abstract sympathy with complete democracy, but because he felt the higher classes would continue to sacrifice the safety of Athens to their own economic security.

In chapter vii Jaeger discusses chiefly the Second and Third Philippics.

The Second fixed the blame for all the failures of Athenian policy upon Aeschines, Eubulus' henchman. The Third, in some ways the most powerful of Demosthenes' orations, marked "a decisive turning point in his political thought." Here he reached a Pan-Hellenic conception. Superficially similar to the view advanced by Isocrates in the letter to Philip, Demosthenes' idea was fundamentally different. For the union which he preached was to be based upon common resistance to Philip. His plan "was the outgrowth of a resolute will for national self-assertiveness, deliberately opposed to the national self-surrender called for by Isocrates." Chapter viii describes the events which led to the oration "On the Crown." The speech cannot be said to mark an advance in Demosthenes' policy. He has reached the moment "when man comes face to face with his own earlier willing and doing as items of history; he then sees them as necessary, and as part of the whole course of events in which he has been involved as a volitional agent." The judgment which the orator pronounced upon his own past Athens accepted, and Aeschines left the city which, according to Demosthenes, he had betrayed.

Such was the development of Demosthenes' policy from the time when he worked with Eubulus to the end when his aggressive devotion to Athens became almost a pathological obsession. To the present reviewer Jaeger's account seems just and accurate. In such a treatment many details of the orator's life and art, naturally, are not discussed. His veracity in statements of fact, his inability to see patriotism or goodness in a political opponent, his honesty in finance—these matters are not treated with the fulness one would find in a strictly biographical account of Demosthenes. Indeed, they do not belong in Jaeger's analysis.

The volume, however, is much more than a thorough and brilliant analysis. It illustrates, without specific reference to Demosthenes, the necessity of

interpreting Greek history in the light of Greek life and experience. In the course of his discussion Jaeger makes many penetrating observations upon various phases of Greek history. In the extensive notes which follow the lectures he makes numerous fertile suggestions for further work to be done. Taken as a whole, the volume is an eloquent and notable contribution to the study of ancient Greece.

The translator, Professor E. S. Robinson of Kenyon College, should be congratulated upon his success in producing a translation which does not appear to be a translation.

STANLEY B. SMITH

Bowdoin College

A Concordance of Ovid. By ROY J. DEFERRARI, SISTER M. INVOLATA BARRY, MARTIN R. P. MCGUIRE. Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 1939. Pp. 2220. \$20.

This *Concordance* represents an immense amount of labor spent in a good cause. Hitherto scholars working on the text or the style of Ovid have been much handicapped by the lack of a comprehensive word index or even of modern indexes to the separate works of the poet. This book will do much to satisfy this want.

As the editors point out in their Preface, their *Concordance* is really a combination of concordance and *index verborum*, that is to say, "no context is furnished in the case of a number of constantly recurring and relatively colorless words, such as pronouns, the forms of *sum*, conjunctions, and prepositions." The current Teubner editions of Ovid have been used as exclusive basis for the *Concordance*. These are Ehwald's 1916 edition of the *Carmina amatoria* and *Medicamina faciei femineae*, the same author's *editio minor* of the *Metamorphoses* published in 1931, the Ehwald-Lenz edition of the *Fasti* and the *Fragmenta* dated 1932, the Ehwald-Levy edition of the *Tristia*, *Ibis*, and *Epistulae ex Ponto* dated 1922, and finally Vollmer's 1911 edition of the *Halieuticon* and *Nux*. The editors have included no variants, "with the exception of variant verses." Words and context are cited under a head word, which is the "basic form of the given word as ordinarily listed and spelled in our Latin lexica." The order of sequence is according to their occurrence in the works of Ovid, arranged in the generally accepted order, with the exceptions that the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti* are placed first and second in the list, since "the *Metamorphoses* are Ovid's masterpiece and since the *Fasti* are related through their aetiological character," and that the positions of the *Tristia* and the *Ex Ponto* are interchanged, for no apparent reason.

Obviously such a work must be appraised from the two points of view of plan and of execution. No objection can be made to the combination of word index and concordance; attempting to give context for all pronouns, conjunctions, etc., would unduly increase the size of a book already very large.

The system of grouping words under head words in order of their occurrence in the works of Ovid, as arranged by the editors of the *Concordance*, seems inferior to that followed by Professor Lane Cooper in his *Concordance to the Works of Horace*, who does not group words under basic forms but lists each word as it appears in the text of Horace, following a strictly alphabetical order. If one wishes to find out how many times and under what circumstances Horace uses the third person singular subjunctive active present of *amo*, one has only to look in Cooper under "amet," where he will find the passages containing "amet" listed according to the accepted chronological order of Horace's works. However if one wants to find out about "amet" in Ovid with the help of the new concordance, one must look up the basic form "amo" and search through ten columns averaging thirty-five citations each, picking out instances of "amet" from a farrago of almost all possible forms of the verb. It seems unlikely that the advantages the editors claim for this arrangement, to wit that it "will enable scholars to study the language, style, and thought of Ovid's works as a whole or individually with the greatest ease" will prove real enough to offset the difficulties it places in the way of rapid location of instances of a given form of a word. If they are studying the language or style of Ovid, scholars will in the majority of cases need information as to the Ovidian use of definite forms of words; if their concern is the thought of Ovid's works, individually or as a whole, they should turn to the text of Ovid rather than to a concordance.

The practice followed by the editors of the *Concordance* in the matter of citing context is admirable; they have made it a rule to give sufficient context to make clear not only the construction of the word in question but, whenever possible, its precise nuance.

Since the text of Ovid, especially of the *Metamorphoses* and of the *Fasts*, is still in a most unsettled condition, it is as well the editors have decided to list no variants, "with the exception of variant verses," for any serious textual criticism of a passage where there is uncertainty as to the true reading must entail reference not only to the *apparatus critici* of the Teubner volumes and to those of other standard editions, such as that of the *Metamorphoses* by H. Magnus, but often to the manuscripts themselves.

The editors attain a high degree of accuracy in the execution of their plan. The list of basic words contains no omissions in so far as this reviewer has been able to ascertain. By an unfortunate slip the genitive *Sapphus* has been listed as a basic form, i.e., as if it were a nominative singular. In the course of looking up a considerable number of words none has been found to be lacking and, with the exception just given, no errors in the listing of the head words.

No cases have been found where the context given was inadequate or otherwise unsatisfactory. Occasional inconsistencies—such as *s.v.* "absisto" citing the context in *Met.* xi. 531 thus: "nec prius absistit fessam obpugnare carinam,/quam," whereas in *Met.* xii. 534 only this much context is given:

"nec prius abstimus ferro exercere dolorem," although again the following line begins with "quam"—are impossible to avoid in a work of this size.

As regards the words in the case of which word-index procedure is followed, no distinction is made between the pronominal forms *nostri* and *nostrum* (genitives). Among the references *s.v.* "nostri," we find *Ep.* iv. 28 and x. 74. Checking with the Teubner text reveals that in these two cases Ovid uses the form *nostrum*. Instances of the analogous forms "vestri" and "vestrum" are, however, enumerated under their respective heads.

The editors give no explanatory table of the symbols they employ. Their apparent intention is to astericize, bracket, and inclose in parentheses such lines or words as are so treated in the Teubner editions. This procedure, especially in the case of asterisks, gives rise to some confusion. For example, *s.v.* "haereo" we find the verse *Ep.* xx. 12 preceded by an asterisk. Referring to the Preface of the Teubner edition containing the *Epistulae* we find that in this volume lines which are not written by the first hands of manuscripts P and R are thus noted; verses lacking altogether in P and R but which the editor feels may be genuine are astericized and bracketed and those which he considers spurious are bracketed but not astericized.¹

Incidentally, the first distich of *Ep.* xii is starred and bracketed by the Teubner editor. In the six times the first line of this distich is cited in the *Concordance* it is starred but preceded by a parenthesis instead of a bracket. In the four times the second line of the distich is cited it is starred and followed by a parenthesis.

Turning to the Teubner text of the *Metamorphoses*, the first asterisk we find is after i. 545. Here the sole purpose of the symbol is to refer the reader to two lines which the editor prints in small type at the bottom of the page. The first of these two lines is preceded by an asterisk, corresponding to the one after vs. 545 in the text. In the Teubner text there is no line 546—the two lines in small type at the bottom of the page are not numbered. In Magnus' edition these lines are designated as 545a and 546, and we shall so refer to them. In the *Concordance s.v.* "numen," vs. 545 is quoted without an asterisk, quite correctly, since the asterisk which follows this line in the Teubner simply refers to the two lines in small type at the bottom of the page, the first of which is preceded by a corresponding asterisk. In the *Concordance* 545a, *s.v.* "vinco" is cited as 545 and astericized; vs. 546, *s.v.* "laedo" is cited as vs. 547 and not astericized; although the real line 547 is cited as such *s.v.* "placeo." A similar confusion in the use of asterisks is found in citations of *Met.* iv. 767.

In the Preface to his edition of the *Fasti* Lenz explains that he uses the asterisk to indicate lines he considers to have been re-worked by Ovid after Augustus' death.²

¹ Ovidius, ed. R. Ehwald, I, *Praefatio*, vi.

² Ovidius, ed. Ehwald-Lenz, III, Fasc. 2, *Praefatio*, x, n. 1.

There is nothing in the *Concordance* to indicate the particular signification of the asterisk in so far as the *Fasti* are concerned. Also, in the *Concordance Fast.* iii. 814 s.v. "ensis" is astericized, although it is not so marked in the Teubner edition.

Users of the *Concordance* will have, therefore, to turn to the Teubner volume from which a given verse is taken to ascertain the meaning of asterisks, etc., appended to it in the *Concordance*.

The *Concordance* is a handsome book; it is phototyped and remarkably distinct throughout. Students of Ovid will gladly overlook its few imperfections in their gratitude for the great service the editors have rendered the poet.

RICHARD T. BRÜERE

University of Chicago

Varro on the Latin Language: With an English Translation, Vol. II, Books VIII-X, and the Fragments. By ROLAND G. KENT. ("Loeb Classical Library.") Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press; London: William Heinemann, Ltd., 1938. Pp. 369-676. \$2.50 (leather, \$3.50).

No reader, not even a reviewer, but only the author himself, can know just how much devoted labor has gone into the making of a work so excellent as Kent's *Varro de lingua Latina*, now happily completed, three good indexes and all. The paging is continuous with that of Volume I, and the indexes, which are good, for I, who say so, have tested them, refer to the books and sections of the text, so that they can be used with a minimum of trouble. A comparative enumeration of the fragments puts the reader *en rapport* with the defunct Goetz and Schoell. Where they had gone before, no gleaner would expect the fields to be anything but bare of all but the very stubble, and Kent has identified no new fragment. Yet is everything garnered? Here is at least one grain that I picked up with the first glance at that very dry and dusty field, the Glossaries: editors of Censorinus, so far as I can ascertain, have not referred to any of Varro's works, whether extant or lost, the account of *adolescens* which Censorinus (14. 2) ascribes to Varro. But as Lindsay observed (*Gloss. Lat.*, IV, 98) of an item of Paul. ex Fest. (*adolescit*) "eccc diversa vocabula sub eodem lemmate, more Varronis in Ling. Lat., tractata." Put together with the reference in Censorinus ("Varro putat . . . *adulescentes* ab *alescendo*," etc.), the Paul. ex Fest. looks as if it must go back to the *De ling. Lat.*, in the extant portion of which this word is not discussed at all. How much more by a systematic gleaning the Glossaries still have to yield, will of course be discovered only by doing it.

It is Books v-vii of the *De lingua Latina*, Kent's first volume, which expose one of the most learned of the ancients in the act of "taking leave of his usual sanity." The scribes seem to have been afflicted with lunacy; and we moderns are almost deprived of *our* sanity, if we have to do more than take note of what the crazy manuscript tradition has preserved of the medley of

sense and nonsense that passed for etymology with Varro, either because we must needs try to make sense of the nonsense or because the temptation to "emend" becomes an irresistible itch. If a man will sail those seas, he must be forever on his guard against now an etymological Scylla, now a textual Charybdis, and presently stop his ears against a hundred and one siren calls or take forethought to escape some Circaean snare. But Kent, being *πολύμητις*, has come through well, and "'tis greatly to his credit." By comparison Books viii-x are plain sailing; *pellacia ponti*, perhaps, but *placidi*, all the same.

The vulgate, therefore, for this second volume was, to begin with, in a less corrupt state than that of Books v-vii, emendation is less tempting and less necessary, and Kent's text correspondingly sounder than that of Volume I. There are not only many fewer of Kent's own changes but fewer of those of other scholars, either singly or taken all together. Correction of the manuscripts had gone far at the hands of older generations of scholars, and it is doubtful whether modern etymological studies can do much for Books v-vii. But if the text of Volume I was more difficult to present in a readable fashion, the subject matter of the books dealing with inflection and derivation, originally Books viii-xiii, of which all after the tenth are lost, was more difficult and duller. Even traditional study of the grammar of the two classical languages, with all the medieval vocabulary and classification that still cling about its technique, has discarded a good deal that seemed important to Varro as now being no longer worth the briefest of brief mention. The dispute between the analogists and the anomalists has vanished forever, thanks to the realization of the true nature of linguistic analogy that comparative philology has given us; hence (p. 389, n. c) *ἀναλογία*, *analogia*, is not quite the same as what linguists mean nowadays by "analogy"—in fact, on the next page, Kent himself properly observes that it is better, as his practice is, "henceforth to translate *analogia* by Regularity or the like, rather than to keep the word Analogy." Since the historical and comparative method of treating linguistic phenomena was still to be devised, how could Varro have guessed that analogy had been at work in the formation of *dominorum* or *dierum*, not to mention *dominarum* or (n. pl.) *domini*?

Barren and futile as the entire dispute now seems, it yet marks an important stage in the development of the study of language. Varro's account of the origin of inflection (viii. 3 ff.) is just about as antiquated and, therefore, chiefly of historical interest. From the imaginary relationship held to subsist between dialectics and linguistics, which was inherited from the Greek grammarians, we are only now finally ridding ourselves at the very moment at which logicians have chosen to return the compliment by discovering that logic is syntax, rather than syntax logic. Kent's translation of what is left of Varro's discussion of these and like matters is accurate, and his notes, apart from such elementary¹ ones as the statement (p. 376, n. b) that *uis* is genitive as well as nominative, make it as interesting as it can be made. The dog-

¹ The same adjective applies to the notes on pp. 417 b, 418 c, and not a few others.

matic school of grammarians had raised its head long before Varro's day (viii. 64 ff.), but Varro's common sense compelled him to plead for a standard based on usage (viii. 79). Again, modern teachers of Latin may do worse than learn from Varro the history and reason of some of their still current terminology (e.g., *participia*, x. 34). The entire work is carefully printed—the offending misprint is on page 447 (*for in read is*); and it maintains a high standard in a series which has set its standard high.

The sample criticisms and suggestions which follow, mostly in Book viii, are made as an indication of the very great value of Kent's interpretative edition of the *De lingua Latina*. The editor has made this work of Varro's readily available even to those who have little or no knowledge of the history of the Latin language, or of ancient grammatical theory.²

viii. 4. If the reading *ac* (Spengel) is correct, then the translation "either . . . or . . ." is not. And, in fact, Varro does not in the sequel pursue the point, or distinguish a "gentile" from an "agnate" derivation of forms.

viii. 7. Matte's insertion of *binæ*, which Kent adopts, is confirmed by ix. 64 (*unæ bigæ et binæ*, etc.); the contrast in number can be expressed only by the collective (or distributive) modifier. Since, in Latin, the only distinction in point of number which is marked by inflection is between one and more than one, *binæ* is enough to make the plural form which the sense requires.

viii. 8. (cf. ix. 34): *imposuerunt* and *imposuerint* have been standardized by the editor (see I, xxvii), but he will admit (see *ibid.*, p. xvii) that they are not therefore necessarily what Varro wrote. Fay's *putaremus* at viii. 10 is no improvement over the *putarent* of the manuscripts.

viii. 14. *ceruices* was "the muscles of the neck and shoulders," hence the use of the plural; cf. Ernout-Meillet ("il s'agirait, étymologiquement, des masses musculaires qui, dans la région de la nuque, soutiennent la tête").

viii. 18. Since all the adjectives in this section are derived from nouns, Kent must be right in taking *atro* as a subst. neut. sg., *atrum*, "black." This form should be added, therefore, in *Thes. ling. Lat.*, II, 1021, 13, which knows only the neut. plu. ("black things, blackness") from classical Latin (Cic. *Tusc.* v.114; Ovid *Met.* xi. 314).

² One or two bibliographical items that I have picked up may be noted here. They are doubtless known to Kent already, but they may be useful to some of his readers: J. Oko (on v. 7-10), *Eos*, XXXVIII (1937), 157-68; H. J. Rose (on v. 69), *Folk-lore*, XLVII (1936), 396-98; A. E. Giffard (on vi. 64-65, where G. was in part anticipated by Bergk and Antonius Augustinus), *Rev. de philol.*, LXI (1935), 82-83. *Arch. Philologicum*, I (1930) (Kovno), 5-20, I have not seen.

Beside *turdelix* (vi. 2), explained in my review of Vol. I (from *turdela*, cf. Festus, p. 277 [ed. Lindsay; 1930], *Isid. Et.* 12. 7. 71; and, for the ending, *mustela*) we have now yet another rustic term (cf. *coturnix*, *cornix*, *spinturnix*), a *k*-stem (cf. *cimex*, *sorex*, *murex*, *pulex*), known only from its Romance derivatives, viz., **auler* (see G. Alessio, *Riv. di filologia*, XIV [1936], 364-67).

A recent Italian discussion of ancient theory is that of F. della Corte, *La Filologia latina dalle origini a Varrone* (Turin, 1937).

viii. 31. *uestiti . . . honeste*: "decently (not 'honorably') clothed."

viii. 36. (p. 399, n. a). *Lua Saturni* is nothing more than *Saturnia Lua*, cf. *Saturnia Iuno*, and the "formulaic connexion" to be pushed no farther.

viii. 56. (p. 415, n. a): not "wrong forms" but "forms not in use," a distinction the importance of which in linguistics no one knows and appreciates better than Kent.

viii. 59. Fay's addition of *locutus et uenatus* was not justified. It adds nothing to the argument, and it is not demanded by the context. Varro, as Kent remarks (p. 418, n. f), is by no means logical in every detail; he merely chops logic when he declares that *curro* lacks the perfect participle, however illogical the multipersonal construction *cursum est* may appear to the school-boy, whose perplexity over the *cursus* which some dictionaries and grammars used "logically" to furnish as the "fourth principal part" of *curro* Varro would have shared. Varro's own inconsistency of citation disfavors Fay's addition, logical though it be.

viii. 65. Scaliger's *alauda alaudas* for the *alacco alaucus* of the manuscripts is not defensible on the ground that "at any rate *alauda* is Celtic," for *Alaucos* is Celtic too. It is found on bronze coins of the Aedui (Muret-Chabouillet, Nos. 5081 f.). Moreover, Varro's words "Gallorum ac ceterorum" do not make *alacco alaucus* specifically Gaulish or Celtic. Finally, as Kent's translation makes clear, it is *personal* names the declension of which Varro is discussing. Hence, the reading *Alacco Alaucus* is not seriously corrupt, whatever the case of *Alacco* may be. Potsherds have not only *Al(l)auci ma(nu)* (*CIL*, XIII, 10010, 75 b²) but also *Alocos* (*ibid.*, 75) and the *Allucius* (Livy xxvi. 50. 2) cited by Holder (*Altcelt. Sprachschatz*, I, 105) with the variant spellings *Alicius*, Ἀλλούκιος, Ἀλούκιος, Ἀλούκκιος, *Alluqi*, *Aluquii*, *Alluquio*, *Alluqui* (the last four all *io*-stems, *Al(l)uq(u)ius*, and all from Spain) ought also to be taken into account. It is conceivable, in view of the Spanish forms, that Varro wrote "Gallorum et Celtiberorum." For some other suggestions, see *PID* II, 193, *Harv. Stud.*, XLII, 149 (cf. Walde-Hofmann, p. 844).

viii. 67 (p. 424, n. a). It might have been added that *dens* was originally participial in formation, cognate with *edo* "eat," so that Varro's gen. pl. *dentum* may well be a genuine, if antiquated, variant.

viii. 71. For the reason why the older ending of the gen. plu. -um was retained in words designating weights and measures, see Exon, *Hermathena*, No. XL (1914), pp. 25-30. Like *milleassarius*, adj., "worth one thousand asses," was *sestertius* "worth two and a half *nummi*," also an adjective, and perhaps always an adjective, even in *in sestertio uicies egere*, which makes it difficult, if not impossible, to see *sestertium* as gen. pl. in *uicies sestertium*, with or without *centena milia*.

viii. 79. *aucella*, which does exist, must stand for an older **auicella*, and indeed that also turns up in Latin of the sixth century. Varro made a mistake when he said that *auis* does not give a double diminutive; that is all. It does not help matters to write *au(i)cella* for the manuscript *aucella*. Even

if Varro had written *auicella*, his general statement that *auis* is one of the words in which "minima . . . non sunt" still would have been wrong, despite the fact that *auicella* was obsolete in his own day and not remade for another six centuries—*auicella* does occur and that is enough; *auis* has a "minimum," namely, *auicella*. If the author himself has blundered over his facts, no amount of tinkering with the manuscripts, merely for the purpose of appearing to remove the initial blunder, can save him from its consequences; indeed, as here, it will simply corrupt the text.

viii. 84. Kent is quite right in saying that the cognomen *Lesas*, which Varro explains as of local origin (cf. *Urbinas*), is not otherwise known. But I do not suppose that he invented it; if it is not from the *Λῆσα* in Sardinia mentioned by Ptolemy (iii. 3), it may well come from some other name in *Les-*, with which *Lesis* (Tab. Vel.), *Lesora*, *Lesura*, and *Laesora* (in Gaul, see Pauly-Wissowa-Kroll s.vv.) would presumably be connected.

ix. 4 (p. 443, n. b). *quā* instrumental rather than ablative (Stolz-Leumann, p. 287).

ix. 42. On *uox* and *uerbum*, compare also Hor. *Serm.* i. 3. 103 (after Lucretius), where the correct reading is *donec uerba, quibus sensus, uocesque, notarent* (see Housman, *Jour. Philol.*, XVIII, No. 35 [1889-90], p. 6; Housman's remarks on the meaning of *uox*, *uerbum* are also worth pondering). The Lucretian doctrine of *utilitas* as the mother of speech (v. 1029) finds an echo in Varro (ix. 48) as well as in Horace.

ix. 95. But *genus* in the verb also includes what is now called "voice" (see *Thes. ling. Lat.*, VI, 2, 1901, 83 ff.).

ix. 107. The meaning "washed, bathed" of *lautus* is rare enough for this example to be added in the dictionaries.

Frag. 11 (p. 608, n. d). There is nothing in the form to show whether the Oscan *zicolom* was masc. or neut. Comparison with Latin *diculus* suggests that it was most probably masculine, but the neuter is not excluded.

J. WHATMOUGH

Harvard University

Attische Familienkomedien vom umstreeks 300 v. Chr. I. Het origineel van Plautus' Epidicus. By W. E. J. KUIPER. Amsterdam: Swets & Zeitlinger, 1938. Pp. 67. Fl. 1.20.

Students of Greek and Roman comedy can ill afford to neglect Dutch scholarship; among recent important publications in Dutch are Kuiper's reconstruction of six comedies of Menander from their Latin adaptations¹

¹ W. E. J. Kuiper, "Grieksche origineelen en Latijnsche navolgingen," *Verhandel. der kon. Akademie v. Wetensch. Amsterdam*, XXXVIII, Part II (Amsterdam, 1936). This 300-page work reconstructs from the Latin plays the Greek *Eunouchos*, *Heauton Timoroumenos*, *Andria*, *Adelphoi*, *Synaristosai* (*Cistellaria*), and *Dis Ezapaton* (*Bacchides*) (see L. A. Post in *Amer. Jour. Phil.*, LIX [1938], 367-69).

and Enk's two-volume work on Plautus.² Kuiper has now added to his other good work a most interesting discussion of Plautus' *Epidicus*.

The author treats anew the curious structure of the play and attempts to reconstruct the plot of the Greek original. He accepts Dziatzko's hypothesis that the Greek play concluded with the marriage of Stratippocles and his half-sister, an ending which Plautus had to omit since such marriages were impossible at Rome. He strengthens this theory by showing rather conclusively (pp. 20 ff.) that the first deception (by which Periphanes is convinced that Acropolistis is his daughter) could have had in the original only one purpose—the union of Stratippocles to his supposed half-sister. This then is the wedding of which there are traces in Plautus (ll. 190, 267, 361).³ Periphanes' desire for this marriage is, as Kuiper implies (and he might well have developed this point further), a serious threat to Stratippocles' happiness when the youth transfers his affections from Acropolistis to the captive. Kuiper is less convincing when he attempts to prove that Epidicus deceived Stratippocles and let him believe that Acropolistis was really his half-sister.

Kuiper builds on the work of Dziatzko, Mesk, and Jachmann, but much of his material is new. Since earlier scholars (Mueller, Langrehr, Schredinger, etc.) were less interested in reconstructing the Greek original than in explaining the difficulties of the Latin play and since also, in their endeavor to defend or condemn *retractatio* or *contaminatio*, they put forward theories which are in part no longer tenable, we should perhaps not blame Kuiper for ignoring this earlier work. It is surprising, however, to find that the thorough discussion of A. L. Wheeler⁴ is nowhere mentioned, and on certain points Kuiper's conclusions seem less attractive than those of earlier writers; for example, Kuiper believes (pp. 28 ff.) that the Greek original contained two soldiers, the *Euboicus* (153) and the *Rhodium* (300) and that the Rhodian is present in *Epid.* 437 ff., while the Eubean soldier appeared in a later scene which Plautus omitted. But the reference in 300 is more probably a fictitious one and part of Epidicus' deception of the *senes*.⁵ The Eubean soldier is the one who appears in 437 ff., not the Rhodian, as Kuiper thinks, and the theory of

² P. J. Enk, *Handboek der Latijnse letterkunde van de oudste tijden tot het optreden van Cicero. Tweede deel: Het tijdsak van letterkundige ontwikkeling onder invloed van het hellenisme: 1. De Dichters Livius Andronicus, Naevius en Plautus* (2 vols.; Zutphen, 1937). Enk not only devotes a chapter to each of the plays but discusses Plautus' life and works in general, and particularly his use of his Greek originals. In addition to 3 or 4 pages of bibliography on each play, there are more than 45 pages of general Plautine bibliography, well classified (see R. Helm in *Phil. Woch.*, LVIII [1938], cols. 714–19).

³ This seems more satisfactory than the theory of Mesk ("Der Schluss des Plautinischen *Epidicus*," *Wien. Stud.*, XLVII [1929], 63 ff.) and Enk (*op. cit.*, Vol. II, 1, 1, p. 290) that Periphanes desired his son's marriage merely in order that Stratippocles would leave his house and not oppose his own marriage to Philippa.

⁴ "The Plot of the *Epidicus*," *Amer. Jour. Phil.*, XXXVIII (1917), 237–64.

⁵ Cf. R. Mueller, *De Plauti Epidico* (Bonn, 1865), p. 13; P. Langen, *Plautinische Studien* (Berlin, 1886), pp. 140 f.

two different soldiers seems entirely unnecessary. It is quite possible that in the original ending the Eubean soldier may have appeared a second time and succeeded in his attempt to purchase Acropolistis.

In general, however, Kuiper's workmanship is sane and suggestive. Unlike Jachmann, Norwood, and others who approach Plautus with the belief that what is good must be Greek and what is bad is necessarily Plautine,⁶ Kuiper proceeds from the discrepancies and difficulties of the plot and seeks logical explanations in the assumed structure of the Greek original. It is impossible in the short space of a review to do justice to all the keen observations and new contributions which the author makes, and I can mention merely his more important conclusions. The act-divisions of the Greek original are to be found in the Latin play at lines 165, 381, 606, and 665 (pp. 38 ff.; cf. "Schema van het Origineel," pp. 63 f.).⁷ Only one scene is thus preserved from each of the last two acts. Plautus omitted five scenes of the original: (1) a prologue spoken by a god, which came after line 165 and supplemented the exposition of the human characters (pp. 27 f.); (2) a scene before line 382 (i.e., iii. 1 in the original), in which Epidicus brought to Stratippocles the money from the *leno* and was sent for the *danista* (pp. 37 f., 44 f.); (3) a scene after line 652 (iv. 2 in the original) which contained the real *anagnorisis* of the play; Epidicus, Stratippocles, Telestis, and Philippa were on the stage (pp. 48 ff.); (4) the selling of Acropolistis to her lover, the Eubean soldier, who had been brought by Thesprig; this scene (v. 2 in the original) occurred after line 705 (pp. 54 ff.); (5) a concluding scene wherein Periphanes ordered his son to marry Telestis and informed him of his own approaching marriage to Philippa (pp. 56 f.).

If we accept the theory of Dziatzko, there is nothing inherently improbable about the existence of scenes 3, 4, and 5 in the Greek original. Scene 1 is less certain; much of the information may have been contained in the original version of 166 ff. which Plautus abridged because of its content. The point which most strongly supports Kuiper here is the need of the audience to know that the captive is really Telestis. But must we assume that the audiences of Greek comedy were never kept in the dark concerning an important fact of the plot, as is the case in Terence's *Hecyra*?

The omission of scene 2 is bound up with Kuiper's theory that in the original Periphanes gave to Epidicus merely an order to his banker. Only after a sham purchase whereby the *leno* received the money and turned it over to Epidicus was it possible for the slave to bring the money to Stratippocles. This theory makes necessary some extremely complicated off-stage action

⁶ On the curious results of this approach cf. P. W. Harsh, *Studies in Dramatic "Preparation" in Roman Comedy* (Chicago, 1935), pp. 87 n.-89 n.; Enk, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, 1, 2, pp. 269 ff.

⁷ A. Freté ("Essai sur la structure dramatique des comédies de Plaute," *Rev. des étud. lat.*, VIII [1930], 54-56) finds in the *Epidicus* four acts: ll. 1-165, 166-381, 382-606, and 607-731.

and creates additional difficulties: (1) there is less need of the assistance of Apocides if a sham purchase takes place in the presence of a banker; (2) if the hired *fidicina* is present at this fake sale, and Kuiper implies that such is the case (p. 38), it then becomes extremely difficult to understand how Apocides could think that the *fidicina* had herself been deceived (cf. ll. 411 ff.); (3) the theory necessitates most of the Plautine changes and additions (ll. 290, 295, 303, 319, 345-47, etc.) which Kuiper assumes for this act (p. 44), and leads thus to involved procedure on the part of Plautus. It is much simpler to assume that Epidicus himself made all the arrangements and brought the girl to Apocides in the *forum*;⁸ the fact that Apocides is called "skilled in law" (cf. l. 292) does not mean that he must necessarily have been present at the transaction.

Unfortunately, writers of comedy, perhaps even Greek comedy, are not always as logical and as reasonable as scholars assume. In lines 627 f. Stratippocles complains of the *danista*'s delay; therefore, argues Kuiper (pp. 31 f), the *danista* must have been ordered to come; Epidicus is the only available servant and so must have been sent by Stratippocles to summon the *danista* in the scene omitted before line 382. This accounts for Epidicus' absence in the middle of the play which could not have been unmotivated in the original.⁹

On these and other points many readers will perhaps disagree with Kuiper. Much of his work is naturally hypothetical and impossible to substantiate. But Kuiper adds to our understanding of many troublesome points and is always stimulating even when it is difficult to accept his conclusions. In general, he has given excellent support to Dziatzko's theory, and has reconstructed from the *Epidicus* a delightful and almost flawless Greek comedy, although to praise the artistry of the original (p. 57) on the basis of a reconstruction is somewhat dangerous. As an explanation of the difficulties of the *Epidicus*, Kuiper's work merits serious attention. Whereas earlier scholars (e.g., Wheeler, *op. cit.*, p. 264) explained the curious features of the Latin play both by Plautus' treatment of the original and by omission of parts of the play at a later date, Kuiper brings to the problems an explanation which has the virtue of unity. Furthermore, he believes that the Plautine omissions and alterations exist throughout the play. This is a far cry from Fraenkel's statement (*Plautinisches im Plautus* [Berlin, 1922], p. 320) that Plautus was incapable of inventing parts of the plot or of making radical departures from his originals. Jachmann, who accepts Dziatzko's theory, is sufficiently in agreement with Fraenkel that he limits Plautus' changes to a small part of

⁸ Cf. C. Schrelinger, *Observationes in T. Macci Plauti Epidicum* (Schweinfurt, 1884), p. 63; Enk, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, 1, 1, p. 307.

⁹ We learn early in the play that the *danista* has come from Thebes with Stratippocles (l. 55) and will soon arrive to demand his money; hence the need for haste in procuring the forty *minae* (cf. ll. 141 f.). This implies that he will come without being summoned. Kuiper places too much stress on *fazo* (l. 156), which probably means merely "I'll guarantee," "I assure you," as often in Plautus.

the final act (*Plautinisches und Attisches* [Berlin, 1931], p. 220). Kuiper thus provides a healthy corrective to much of the earlier work on the *Epidicus*.

GEORGE E. DUCKWORTH

Princeton University

Plutarch's Life of Aratus with Introduction, Notes, and Appendix. By W. H. PORTER. Cork: Cork University Press; London and New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1937. Pp. cv+97. 5s.

Plutarchi Vitam Arati edidit, prolegomenis commentarioque instruxit A. J. Koster. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1937. Pp. lxxxviii+144. 6 guilders.

These editions deserve to be welcomed. Both give a well-printed Greek text based on that of Ziegler in the Lindsbog-Ziegler edition, and both are practically free from typographical errors that will cause difficulties. (Koster's "C. I. G., II²" for "I. G., II²," whether a slip or a real mistake, will not confuse anyone acquainted with the editions of Greek inscriptions.) Yet both fail to supply what the reviewer had hoped to find—editions that might tempt teachers of Greek to introduce their students to the sources for a fascinating period of history commonly neglected by students of the classics. The blame, however, must be put largely on Plutarch and not on the editors. The reviewer, at least, cannot share Koster's enthusiasm for the work but feels that *Aratus* is Plutarch at his worst. This statement is not made from the point of view that it is poor history or hardly history at all but that it is a poor and superficial biography. In spite of an occasional stricture of his hero that has aroused Koster's enthusiasm for the impartiality of Plutarch, the latter as a whole seems to have accepted Aratus at his own evaluation and has entirely failed to give any deep consideration to the peculiar standard of interstate conduct shown by Aratus in his relation to Macedonia, to tyrants, and to Athens. Another difficulty is the complexity of the historical background, which neither editor has succeeded in simplifying and making intelligible to the elementary student.

Koster's edition is interpretative with little discussion of textual difficulties and excessively lengthy explanatory notes. Both Introduction and Commentary abound in expressions of enthusiastic admiration often emphasized by exclamation points. The editor, however, must be given credit for pointing out that the *Aratus* is not history and for interpreting and judging Plutarch's work on the basis of the author's purpose. In technique of bibliography, forms of references, and proofreading the work is almost perfect except for one puzzle. The Table of Contents lists *Errata* for page 145, but the copy on hand, at least, contains neither a page 145 nor a table of *errata*.

A particularly unhappy, not to say naïve, note occurs in connection with the summary in chapter 29 of the slander circulated by the enemies of Aratus. This includes the accusation that he used to give instructions to his officers

before a battle and then withdraw to watch the operations from a distance—*βεβλήσθαι γὰρ τοὺς ἀστραγάλους* (29. 7). The comment is: "Velut si Aratus talis luderet et ideo pugnae interesse nollet! Verum tyranni, qui talibus ineptiis delectati sunt, parum elegantes fuerunt!" The expression clearly is equivalent to the more familiar "*iacta alea est*," and the general meaning is rendered correctly by Perrin (Loeb ed.), "since the die was already cast." Neither Plutarch nor his editor seems to have considered the possibility that in taking up a position from which the entire field of battle could be observed, Aratus as a general was ahead of his time, though his frequent defeats may not have recommended the practice to others.

In his note on 12. 2 in which he maintains that the Mothone from which Aratus sailed on his way to Egypt was not the Messenian city but Methone between Epidaurus and Troezen, Koster may have hit upon the truth, but his discussion is far from adequate. He has ignored not only the epigraphic evidence, which indicates that the form of the name used locally was Methana and that the town had a Ptolemaic garrison, but even the evidence of Strabo (cf. Ernst Meyer in P.-W., s.v., "Methana"). Against his theory is the fact that the form of the name found in Plutarch otherwise is never used for Methana; but this is hardly an insuperable difficulty, for similar names may easily be confused. In favor of the theory are the following considerations: Methana would be a more convenient port for a Sicyonian than Messenian Mothone; a Ptolemaic fort would be the natural starting-point for a mission to Ptolemy; such a starting-point is more easily reconciled with a shipwreck off Andros, if that was the location. Plutarch's sentence: *ἀνήχθη μὲν οὖν ἀπὸ Μοθώνης ὑπὲρ Μαλέας, ὡς τῷ διὰ πόρου ὁρόμῳ χρησόμενος* does not give much help in placing the city if "above Malea" is taken as a description of its location.¹ If, however, it is taken to mean that he started from Mothone by the route past Malea and if Mothone is taken to be Methana near Troezen, everything becomes intelligible. Malea is mentioned because it is not on the usual route, which Aratus avoided to keep away from the Aegean islands, which at the time were under the control of Antigonos. Instead he tried to make a dash across the open sea past Malea and the west end of Crete.²

Porter's edition is more ambitious in two respects: He has bestowed a good deal of attention on the text, gives a separate critical apparatus, and has introduced a number of new readings, some due to himself and some to Dr. R. M. Henry; second, his study of the history of the period and his notes on historical problems are much more searching than those of Koster. Almost every historical problem connected with the career of Aratus, even the classi-

¹ It is so taken by Koster and apparently by Perrin, who translates: "He put to sea from Mothone above Malea." If this was what Plutarch meant, would he not have used the article?

² This interpretation is impossible if *διὰ πόρου* means "by the regular passage" (Porter). But *πόρος* can also mean merely "journey" or "voyage" (examples in Liddell-Scott-Jones *Lexicon* from Aeschylus and Aeschines).

cal problem of the dates of the battles of Cos and Andros, are discussed. The result is that even the specialist feels somewhat oppressed by controversy and that the ordinary student is likely to be completely overwhelmed. It is a pity that the editor did not give a simpler and clearer account and segregate in some way his valuable contributions on controversial questions. As it is, the edition is scarcely suitable for an elementary course but might be used successfully in a seminar, though even then the insufficient bibliographical information (initials of authors are not given) and the practice of citing the view of authors without indicating the pages of their works would be aggravating. Good as Porter's notes on historical questions are, it is disappointing to find no note on the sixty talents for which Aratus deposited "most of his plate and his wife's golden ornaments" (19. 2, Perrin's translation) as security. Here there is something wrong either with the statistics or with Aratus as a democratic hero or both; probably Aratus was a man of substantial wealth, but even so the sum is suspiciously large.

There is not space here to discuss in detail the new readings suggested, some for stylistic reasons, but it can be noted that they reveal a very careful study of the text. Some involve a new interpretation of details of the narrative, but none affect an important historical problem. Porter is too much of a historian to be guilty of the crime sometimes perpetrated by editors of critical editions of rejecting and even omitting from the critical apparatus a manuscript reading that makes perfectly good sense.

J. A. O. LARSEN

University of Chicago

M. Tulli Ciceronis scripta quae manserunt omnia, Fasc. 46: *De divinatione*, *De fato*, *Timaeanus*. OTTONIS PLASBERG † schedis usus recognovit W. Ax. Lipsiae: in aedibus B. G. Teubneri, 1938. Pp. xiv+214.

Otto Plasberg's well-known *editio maior* of six of Cicero's philosophical works, the first fascicle of which, containing the *Paradoxa*, *Academica*, and *Timaeanus*, was published in 1908, and the second, the *De natura deorum*, in 1911, was to have contained also the *De divinatione* and the *De fato*. As late, however, as 1921, as Plasberg then wrote me, the publication of these latter works seemed very doubtful, and his death in 1924 definitely prevented their completion, despite the fact that various notes for them had already been written. In 1917 and 1922, as fascicles 45 and 42 of the Teubner *editio minor* of Cicero, Plasberg had edited the *De natura deorum* and the *Academica* respectively, and of fascicle 45 a new edition, enlarged by nearly fifty pages of notes, was published in 1933 by W. Ax. Finally, as fascicle 46, the two works not published by Plasberg and also the *Timaeanus* appear, under the editorship of Ax, in an *editio minor*.

A brief Preface discusses first the dates of the respective works, concluding that most of the *De divinatione* was composed before the death of Caesar but

that the work was finished after that event and possibly, as maintained by W. Sander, published posthumously. The *De fato* Ax would place after the Ides of March, 44 B.C. (R. Durand in *Mélanges Boissier* [1903], 175, dates it more closely in May-June, 44), and the *Timaëus* seems to fall before the *De natura deorum* (Ax's arguments here agree closely with the reasoning of Schanz-Hosius, *Gesch. d. röm. Lit.*, I⁴ [1927], 508-9).

The account of the manuscripts adds little new. Ax has collated afresh V and B, while for A and H he has used the facsimiles published in the *Codices Graeci et Latini*. The readings of these four codices are regularly given in his apparatus, those of P and F very rarely, and other *recentiores*, such as *Monacensis 528* (S. XI) are omitted. All manuscripts are held to derive from one archetype, as maintained by A. C. Clark and Plasberg.

The treatment of the text appears sensible and conservative. As a sample of the work I have compared the first book of the *De divinatione* with the previous Teubner text by C. F. W. Müller, and aside from slight orthographic divergences, such as *-imus* or *-umus* in superlatives, *quom* and *cum*, *is* and *iis*, *exp-* and *exp-*, *ext-* and *ext-*, etc., the differences are surprisingly few, with Ax usually holding more closely than Müller to the manuscripts. The most considerable changes are to be found in the verses of Accius and Ennius quoted in i. 45 and i. 66, respectively. At i. 16 Ax retains *posse* (deleted by various editors since Marsus); in i. 20 he accepts Plasberg's *volvier in gentem* and *tum legum* (see *Rh. Mus.*, LIII [1898], 95-97), and at i. 34 (I think unnecessarily) Hottinger's *divinitatem* for *divinationem* of AVB. In i. 61 *affluenti* alongside of *affluit* seems unduly confusing; in the puzzling passage in i. 92 he reads *filiis x singulis*, and at i. 95, with the best manuscripts, retains *dum habent auspicia*. Several words or phrases bracketed by other editors as glosses are here accepted as authentic. The only misprint I have noted in the text is on page 22 (l. 27): *veruncent*.

For the *De fato* it is surprising that no notice is taken of the edition by A. Yon in the Budé series (1933), for this, unlike some older editions and certain lesser critical studies upon these three works, can hardly have been unknown to the editor and might at certain points have been of distinct aid.

The *Timaëus*, which in the *editio maior* had the Greek and Latin texts printed in alternate lines, here relegates the Greek to the bottom of the page—a simpler method for the printer but one which makes appreciably more difficult the study of Cicero's art as a translator. Nor is it made clear to the reader what edition of Plato is used for the Greek text (Plasberg in the *editio maior* had given variants based on Burnet's edition, which are here omitted).

A rather full *index vocum et rerum notabilium* and a separate index of proper names complete a book which should be of considerable help to the serious student of Cicero.

ARTHUR STANLEY PEASE

Harvard University

Götter und Kulte im Ptolemäischen Alexandrien. By ELIZABETH VISSER. ("Universiteit van Amsterdam, Archaeologisch-Historische Bijdragen," Deel V.) Amsterdam: Allard Pierson Stichting; N. V. Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers-Mij., 1938. Pp. 130.

The author has endeavored to bring together the written sources of religious life in Ptolemaic Alexandria. Most of the archeological material, aside from a few coins, is put aside as too difficult to date. Moreover, only the Greek sources are considered, since the author limits the scope of the study to the Greek population of the polyglot city.

Chapter i takes up a long series of deities, arranged alphabetically in groups, and discusses briefly the evidence for the worship in Alexandria. Both in this chapter and in the *Quellenverzeichnis* at the end of the volume the evidence for the worship is not confined to documents which refer only to Alexandria. Many documents from other sites in Egypt are mentioned and included. Some attention is given to the theophoric names, but a still more useful feature is the list of citizen-names with citations and dates.

Chapter ii contains a discussion of the religious ideas and practices as expressed by the poets—particularly by Callimachus, Theocritus, and Apollonius. Little is accomplished in this chapter, since the conclusion is reached that the poets dealt with gods as poetic symbols rather than as religious realities. As the author remarks, it is almost impossible to separate the religion from the poetry.

The most important parts of the work are chapter i and the documents and list at the end. Concerning the list of names, we should not delude ourselves that our prosopographic work is of transcendent importance. This work is useful and needs to be done by someone. Moreover, the collection of documents given here is extremely valuable because it draws together much scattered material. The author refers to Hopfner's *Fontes* only under "Sarapis" but might have given more frequent mention to this great collection of literary material.

The sources for any phase of life in Alexandria in this period are meager enough. It is my opinion that the author handles this material very judiciously. She does not err by trying to make the material mean more than it does mean. For instance, in dealing with the ruler-cult she admits that one cannot tell what people really thought or believed about it on the basis of this material. Kings and gods are mentioned together, yet she insists that there is no real identification of the ruler with the god. The cult of Sarapis is well handled. She refers to Sarapis as "der vom Hof propagierte Sarapis" (p. 50). This is proper, I think, since we can show that the royal officials did promote the cult, while this promotion can be traced to the monarch only through literary references whose meaning is obscure. On the other hand, the statement is misleading that when Alexandria was founded the Greeks had already been worshiping Isis in Greece for a long time. We do not know how far back of the date of IG², II, 337 the practice goes in Athens. The author

says that if the dynasty had not promoted the worship of Sarapis, Osiris would have been united with Isis in the Greek cult. She further says that Isis drew Sarapis along with her for a long time. I think it is difficult to show that the cult of the Egyptian gods would have been of any great importance to Greeks without Sarapis. The character of Osiris was rather firmly fixed by this time. Again, the growth of the cult of Sarapis is almost overexplained if one thinks of the dynasty pushing and Isis pulling him along. My own work has led me to believe that, in a very real sense, in the formation of the Hellenistic cult Sarapis travels largely under his own power. One might also question the importance which the author attaches to the later identifications of Sarapis with Helios and other gods.

This is a useful monograph. Precisely because the author abjures large and fancy theories, one can the better use the material presented. There is an Index in addition to the texts and list of names. I hesitate to criticize the author's method since all studies must be confined in somewhat arbitrary limits. I cannot but wish, however, that she had been able to include a consideration of more archeological evidence, especially the wealth of material in the Alexandria Museum.

THOMAS A. BRADY

University of Missouri

Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch. By A. WALDE. 3d ed. by J. B. HOFMANN. Part XI (with Title-Page and Preface to Vol. I). Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1938. Pp. 801-72 (+ i-xxxiv). Rm. 2.10.

Tennyson's "Brook," thy name is "Wörterbücher" ("und Enzyklopädien")! Walde-Hofmann has got to the end of letter *L* and of Volume I—and for that we may be unfeignedly thankful. The first part appeared in 1930, so this eleventh has some thirty pages of additions and corrections (*argentifodina* still missing, *s.v.*, *argentum*, *v. fodio*, though W.-H. usually lists the more important compounds). In a recent number of *Indogermanische Forschungen* Edward Hermann protested, with good reason, against the duplication and reduplication of effort and matter that etymological dictionaries seem to thrive upon—Feist, Walde-Pokorny, Walde-Hofmann, Wüst, all saying the same things over and over again. Surely, within the boundaries of one land, with its perfect organization, so many works of supererogation must be deplored.

But this fault, if it be a fault, is the only serious one to be charged against Walde-Hofmann. And a defense is made in the Preface and a justification for going back to discussions older than Vaniček and Curtius, on the ground of completeness. It is a justification that covers a multitude of remonstrances; for Hofmann may truly plead that, with the limitation only of human frailty, his citation of the evidence, and of argument about it and about, is complete.

It is almost superhuman. Yet, in spite of all, we cannot but notice how the old nuts still refuse to be cracked: p. xi, Latin *b* from *m* before *r* ("wohl auch im Anlaut") *breuis*, p. xii, *f* "kaum *m*- vor *r*-" *fraces*.

I have read the "Lieferung" through, and I have noted exactly one hundred and fifteen items which I should like to discuss, by way of addition or correction. Of these I offer a mere handful.

P. 824. To the interesting list *Leucetius*, *Leucimalacus* etc., add *Louccianus* (Belluno), which shows the Venetic *ou* for older *eu* (cf. *Harv. Stud.*, XLIV, 104).

836. Something is still to be learned from Darbshire (*Trans. Camb. Philol. Soc.*, III [1892], 187 ff.), about *lupus* and its cognates. Besides, even if there weren't, what about "completeness," you know?

812, *s.v.*, *lira*. The succinct "seit Colum." disguises the extreme rarity of the word in Latin literature. If it was current at all, which I doubt, it was so only on the farms. Both Latin and the dialects know the verb, even the compound verb, best.

814. The spelling *littera* (and pronunciation), for the older *litera*, points strongly to Oscan mediation in this word (cf. Ernout-Meillet, *s.v.*, where the meaning of the word, if not the word itself, is taken to be "calqué" "sur un mot grec," improbable as that view is), as if **li-tra*, with gemination (cf. Ose. *alltram*, *pinttram*), and anaptyxis. Oscan letters (not letters of the alphabet, but "la littérature") may have brought the word to Rome.

842. Jokl's guess that "Illyr." Ἀσίνη, *Asamum* belong with Lat. *acer* is simply incredible; on page 844 Illyr. *Agruuium* is connected with *ager*. These conjectures cannot both be right.

843. *aedes*. Cf. ("zur Bed.-Entw.") Serv. auct. *Aen.* i. 446, *aedes sacras ita templa faciebant*, etc.; in which the text is sound (translate "they made *templa* [i.e., regions and buildings set apart from secular for religious use] into *aedes sacrae* as follows . . ."). My attention was called to this place in Servius by my colleague E. K. Rand.

845. *Alpes*. Cf. Messap. σαλβαλλη (PID, Glossary, *s.v.*, and especially II, 386, n. 1), which appears to be a compound of two well-known local names (cf. *Sallentini*, *Salluuii*).

847. Apollo has now been run to earth in Hittite (cf. *Idg. Jahrb.*, 1936 [1938], p. 376).

848. *artrare* is not "Pflug" (and I never said it was), but "pflügen."

861. If, as he says, Hofmann seeks to cite authorities completely, he should give credit for this, the correct explanation of *pido*, to Torp (*IF*, V [1895], 198).

A form with *-k-* (cf. *facio*, ἔθηκα, ἔδωκα) well worth citing, is the Cyprian present δώκω and, from Hellenistic Greek, στήκω.

864, *s.v.*, *far*. Compare the gloss *farra*: *ueteres farre uiuebant, uel (ut?) Cymbri*, etc., which I discussed (Welsh *bara*, "bread") in *Bull. Board Kelt. Stud.*, I, 4 (1923), 309 f. (*Lib. Gloss.*, FE, 229).

868, *s.v.*, *gigno*. There is no Messapic word *inzanixis*, and if there were, it could not be cognate with *gigno*; and, if it could, *Anduno-cnetis* would not. But Hofmann likes both to have his cake and to eat it (see above, on 842), which cannot be done—at least not in this very imperfect world.

S.v. gratus cf. Sicel *brtom*.

869, *s.v.*, *humus*. See Kretschmer (*Glotta*, XXVII [1938], 31) on some possible cognates.

The "Indogermanische Bibliothek," to which Walde-Hofmann belongs, was begun, as we all know, by Hirt and Streitberg. They are both dead, and the new editor-in-chief is Hermann Güntert. *Quid plura?*

Harvard University

J. WHATMOUGH

Delphes au II^e et au I^{er} siècle depuis l'abaissement de l'Étolie jusqu'à la paix romaine 191-31 av. J.-C. By GEORGES DAUX. ("Bibliothèque des écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome," Fasc. 140.) Paris: E. de Boccard, 1936. Pp. iii+745.

Pausanias à Delphes. By GEORGES DAUX. Paris: A. Picard, 1936. Pp. ii + 207.

These two books by a master thoroughly familiar with Delphic epigraphy and topography and the literature on the subjects are valuable contributions each in its own way, but the first place both for the magnitude of the task and for the importance of the results obtained must be given to the larger work. Together with the volume by Robert Flacelière¹ on the third century B.C. it completes a series of excellent studies by French scholars supplying an introduction to the Delphic inscriptions of the various periods and the historical problems connected with them. Each of Daux's books includes in the Introduction a full description of earlier literature on the subjects considered.

Delphes au II^e et au I^{er} siècle will long retain a high place among the great works on Hellenistic and Roman Greece. It is primarily a book for scholars and particularly epigraphers and historians, but even more casual readers will be fascinated by the manner in which difficult material is put in order and made to yield results and surprised at the amount of positive information derived from the inscriptions. The problem of chronology is in the forefront, but there is also much on political, social, and economic history and on the use of propaganda. Some of the more important subjects discussed are the relations of Delphi with her neighbors in central Greece, with the Aetolians, with Rome, and with Hellenistic monarchs. Unpublished inscriptions are taken into consideration, and for a considerable number of published inscriptions new readings are suggested; for several of these the text is given

¹ *Les Aitolians à Delphes*. Paris: E. de Boccard, 1937.

in full. Equally important is the redating of inscriptions. Thus *SGDI*, 2146, which records a manumission fee of twenty minas—the highest known at Delphi—was formerly dated “Unbestimmt; vielleicht 150–100” but is now shown by means of prosopographical evidence to belong to the second quarter of the first century (pp. 465 f., cf. p. 175). Special indexes list the Delphic archons and the inscriptions for which new readings and emendations are offered. The plates and diagrams are excellent.

Pausanias à Delphes is primarily a study of the methods employed by Pausanias. The text of the pertinent parts of Book X are given with a translation followed by a detailed commentary and a special chapter on the methods of Pausanias. The conclusion is that while he drew on literary sources for his history and legends, the description of the monuments is based on personal observation and is an honest and valuable contribution, though Pausanias was hurried and superficial, omitted a number of things, and failed to decipher successfully difficult inscriptions. Not least valuable is the observation that he was not interested in anything modern but only in what was old and that he mentions no monument later than 260 B.C. There are a number of good illustrations and adequate plans, though it is unfortunate that the key to the use of the plans is relegated to a footnote on page 6.

J. A. O. LARSEN

University of Chicago

Die Trilogie des Aischylos: Formgesetze und Wege der Rekonstruktion. By FRANZ STOESSL. Baden bei Wien: Rudolf M. Rohrer, 1937.

The author of this study attempts to reconstruct lost plays by noting formal relations of tragedies in the same trilogy and by observing in extant plays traces of the re-working of familiar plots. He concludes from the inorganic appearance of Oceanus in the *Prometheus Bound* that there must have been a corresponding appearance of a successful mediator, namely Ge, in the *Prometheus Unbound*. He concludes from the double announcement in the *Agamemnon*, by watchman and herald, of the fall of Troy, that the watchman is Aeschylus' invention. Hence he observes that we may expect to find in the prologue of any play an immediate exposition of the new features in the version presented. He shows, for example, how in the *Electra* of Sophocles and even in that of Euripides the mixture of new and old might be deduced if we did not possess the original. Repetitions, inconsistencies, and unmotivated scenes are explained as retention of traditional themes. In *Oedipus rex* removal of Creon and the messenger from Corinth produces a consistent plot, which incidentally has no three-actor scenes. Stoessel rather surprisingly believes that the original was the *Laius* rather than the *Oedipus* of Aeschylus. So the *Antigone* is the re-working of a play in which Polyneices was properly buried by Antigone with the assistance of Ismene. The reconstructions are fully

worked out with an abundance of acute observation and deduction as well as light on problems of genuineness or chronology. It is a stimulating exercise, though naturally not always convincing in its conclusions. All five Aeschylean trilogies of which whole plays are extant are treated together with related plays of other tragedians.

The advantages and disadvantages of limiting discussion to formal elements of the plot are obvious. Analysis is stricter, but insufficient allowance is made for considerations that move a creative artist. The unsuccessful mediator of the *Prometheus* becomes organic if we reflect that in no other way could the enmity between rebel and tyrant be so convincingly shown; a successful mediator in the later play points the contrast. That Zeus is victorious, as Stoessl says, I do not believe. The theme of reconciliation of might with right is more in accord with the pride of Aeschylus and his generation in the civilization that they were conscious of creating. So the stage is set in the *Suppliants* for a contrast between marriage by force and the institution of matrimony as part of the fabric of an enlightened state. Chrysothemis and Ismene serve like Oceanus as unsuccessful mediators to throw into relief the fierce spirit of rebellion that Sophocles may have learned from Aeschylus to portray in his tragic heroines and heroes. In spite of limitations, however, the positive contribution made by this book is important, to say nothing of the value of incidental points of interpretation. On page 189 the reference should be to *Ant.* 696, not 596. There is no index.

L. A. Post

Haverford College

De scholiis in Sophoclis tragoedias veteribus. By VITTORIO DE MARCO. ("Memorie della R. Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei; Classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche," Ser. VI, Vol. VI, Fasc. 2.) Rome: Giovanni Bardi, 1937. Pp. 105-229.

Since Papageorgius in 1888 published his Teubner edition of the scholia to Sophocles, much progress has been made. Then too, even at the time, his work was not free from error. Hence, one of the services of the work under review is to act as a kind of revision of Papageorgius, correcting his readings and emendations and adopting the suggestions of other scholars, notably Nauck and Wansink.

Furthermore, believing that L was the best and original source of the scholia, Papageorgius used G and other manuscripts only for obvious corrections or in places where L was illegible. Here the author gives us full collations of three other manuscripts, G, M, and R. Although he has already treated the relationships of these manuscripts,¹ unfortunately for the usability of the present work as a unit, the author has not given us even a brief summary of his

¹ *Studi italiani di filologia classica* (nuova ser.), XIII (1936), 1-44.

findings. Since many of the arguments rest on the basis of this relation, at least a stemma should appear. In brief, the editor regards x as the archetype of our extant manuscripts of which L and y are apographs; from y , in turn, were copied G and z , the latter giving rise to M and R . In other words, GMR are not copies of the scholia in L but represent a distinct tradition. Aside from the value of these new readings for textual criticism, these manuscripts show an additional point important for the study of the scholia. Many of the scholia which stand in L as a unit are shown by the evidence of GMR to have appeared in x in distinct parts and to have coalesced in L through the efforts of some scribe or grammarian who united them by adding connectives. Moreover, this same process apparently had been at work to some degree by the time of x , since GMR show probable combinations which are earlier than L 's. This evidence is, of course, of value in determining the stratification of the scholia and hence their history.

Although no editor of scholia can ever anticipate the needs of all those who will use his work, good help in several categories is given by four indexes: I, readings which point to variants in the text of the plays; II, new readings in the poetic fragments quoted; III, corrections in the text of the scholia offered either by the evidence of GMR or by conjecture; and IV, those scholia in L which GMR show to be agglomerations of previously separate notes. These listings will lead many seekers to the material they desire. A fifth index, however, citing those scholia which appear in GMR but not in L , might well have been added.

The opening chapter traces the history of the annotation of Sophocles in a manner for the most part orthodox yet with some new suggestions. The author considers four stages: first, the pre-Didymean (Alexandrian, perhaps Aristophanes of Byzantium); second, the Didymean; third, the *ὑπόμνημα*, which he considers, rightly I believe, on the basis of some of his evidence, post-Didymean; and finally, Pius, whom he assigns to the late third or early fourth century. These four periods he would prefer to reduce to three by identifying Pius as the author of the *ὑπόμνημα*. Didymus' comments, furthermore, were not derived directly from his work but through the redaction of Sallustius, who drew wholly or mainly from Didymus and hence did not cite him by name, and later through the commentary of Pius, who consulted Didymus and cited him among his other authorities. The chapter closes with a set of rubrics for identifying late scholia.

Some misprints still occur uncorrected (p. 109, n. 1; p. 110, n. 9; p. 112, n. 15; and p. 159, n. 1). On page 133 (on *Ajax* 593), "ut iam Dindorf" is plainly wrong. Elmsley (1825) read *Θεράπονσι* and Papageorgius cites Lascaris as the corrector. The work is well done and one must usually agree with the editor's judgment. For students both of Sophocles and of the history of the text the book brings material of interest.

HAROLD B. DUNKEL

University of Chicago

Hellenistische Epigramme auf Dichter. By MATHÄUS GABATHULER. Dissertation, Basle. St. Gallen, 1937. Fr. 4.50.

Monographs of this kind are useful: it would be more than a mere monument to the industry of central Europe if we might have a series after the model of Mr. Herrlinger's *Totenklage um Tiere* or Mr. Brecht's *Motiv- und Typengeschichte d. gr. Spottepigrams*, to mention only possible extremes of treatment. And, since we cannot all be Weisshäupls, the present dissertation would find an honorable place in the series if it were thoroughly revised and reconsidered. For the author has the instincts of a critic and the industry of a scholar and an almost scientific caution.¹ He has not infrequently added a good deal to our knowledge of these epigrams and his approach is generally cold, circumspect, and reasonably objective. The author whom he appears to me to benefit most is Dioscorides, but then perhaps Dioscorides² needs it most.

But, as usual, there is a reverse to this pleasant medallion: When shall any of us write a perfect book? Here, where the opportunities for mistake are manifold, the errors are numerous. I have space for comparatively few corrections and supplements: If A. von Blumenthal's *Die Schätzung d. Archilochus im Allertum* had been consulted, it would have benefited a number of pages;³ H. Ouvré's thesis, *Quae fuerint dicendi genus ratioque metrica apud Asclepiadem, Posidippum, et Hedylum* (Paris, 1894), wrongly ignored, throws light on a number of difficulties not solved by the author; in Nieaenetus' epigram (AP xiii. 29) see Knox (*Philol.*, LXXXVIII [1932], 30) for the correct reading of verse 2; in Alexander's (AP vii. 709), if Meineke's λάλα (vs. 3) is not read, Cobet's κακά should be, and nothing is said of Plutarch's κρείσσονα or of the quantity of Γύγω (vs. 6);⁴ to note 72 (*ad fin.*) should be added Powell (*Coll. Alex.*, p. 8); as for Leonidas' mistake about planets in the *Phaenomena* (AP ix.25), it seems more likely⁵ that Leonidas simply forgot Aratus' restriction rather than that he hadn't read the poem; on Aleman's previous condition of servitude and similar matters, see now Bowra (*Gr. Lyr. Poets*, pp. 17 f.);⁶ on

¹ In proof of which I cite three notes (nn. 19, 65, and 68), all attacking controversial points of more than ordinary difficulty.

² The life and works of this strange poet should provide a most excellent subject for dissertations. Reitzenstein's article in *RE*, not one of his best, is antiquated, and it has had no successor in print, though there is said to be an unpublished Zurich diss. (O. Moll, 1920).

³ See also Bowra (*Gr. Lyr. Poets*, p. 308) for the Leonidas epigrams.

⁴ It seems likely that even if a learned poet didn't know the difference between *Κανθαύλης* and *Δάσκυλος*, he did know something about quantity.

⁵ Pace Kaibel and almost everyone else. Don't we sometimes forget even large portions, carefully read, of Eddington?

⁶ Though neither Bowra nor anyone else seems to have given enough attention to Leonidas' evidence of Aleman's *ὑμεναῖοι*.

AP vii. 664⁷ and the whole Theocritus-Leonidas question, see now *Class Phil.*, XXXIII, 48-54; to supplement both n.100 and the discussion of an illustrated edition of Dioscorides on page 89, see E.Bethe (*Rh. Mus.*, LXXI [1916], 415-18). It would be easy to extend the list. But perhaps worst of all, Mr. Gabathuler claims on page 2 to give us *einen umfangreichen Apparat*, an unfortunate promise; for it is anything but that, being often incomplete and sometimes careless.

W. C. HELMBOLD

Trinity College, Hartford

The Origins of Latin Love-Elegy. By A. A. DAY, M.A., Ph.D. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1938. Pp. 148. 7s. 6d. net.

The author of this brochure shows a commendable familiarity with the many efforts of others to illustrate the direct or indirect influence on Roman love-elegy of Hellenistic epigram and the New Comedy; he enlarges upon rhetorical exercises as an important factor, in this instance reminding us of a similar theory offered in explanation of the Greek romances; following Hubaux he emphasizes the influence of Latin pastoral. The difficulty in solving the problem arises from the inevitable use of the "parallel passage" as a means of approach, and the value of a given parallel is always open to question. So, for example, the writer minimizes the value of parallel passages in the epistolographers—and often for good reasons—but in his chapters on rhetoric and the pastoral and the New Comedy as influential factors he magnifies the importance of this material and in so doing often lays himself open to the same charges that he has earlier brought against others. Of this weakness he is himself not unconscious, as apologetic sentences on the top of pages 91 and 99 make clear. Nevertheless his critical reactions may help toward a formulation of what constitutes valid significance in parallel passages. The authors of critical studies in the poems of the Vergilian Appendix and in the sources of Roman subjective love-elegy might well combine their forces in determining useful criteria.

Some inaccuracies in details disturb one's faith in the author's larger conclusions. The material on Antimachus on pages 12 and 13 is a strange fusion of evidence bearing on epic as well as elegy though only the latter is relevant; Catullus' ninety-fifth poem simply reflects Callimachus' contentions in favor of the short as against the long epic, and the adjective *tumidus* applied to Antimachus refers to the diffuseness of the long epic rather than to bombast—to quantity rather than quality. On page 81 Vergil's *Eclogues* ii. 45 ff. are compared with Propertius iii. 13. 27 ff., but the passage of Propertius is related, not to the eclogue but to *Copa* 13 ff. On the top of page 119 Propertius i. 1. 3-4 is compared with two verses of the epigram in *AP* xii. 101. 3-4, but

⁷ The doubt (n. 107) about *ἔπεα* (vs. 6) being *ἀπὸ κοινού* appears unjustified.

the preceding verses of Propertius and of the Greek epigram are essential to the comparison. One suspects throughout the chapter on Greek epigram that the writer knows only Dübner's text of the Greek Anthology; otherwise why does he retain the long-abandoned reading in the Palatine manuscript of the Anthology instead of the text found on a house wall on the Esquiline Hill, in Callimachus' epigram (*AP* xii. 118. 3-4) as quoted on page 132? Wilamowitz' edition of the poet's epigrams (No. XLII) provides the proper text. Misprints are frequent, and the various abbreviations of Wilamowitz' name in the footnotes are almost discourteous.

Having discussed all the probable factors, Day reaches the conclusion, cautiously expressed, that the love-elegy is the result of a fusion of all these different elements. This will seem a *pis aller* to many readers except in so far as poetic creation often includes a recollection of earlier literary tradition as well as a play of fancy independent of literary sources.

HENRY W. PRESCOTT

University of Chicago

Petronius in Italy, from the Thirteenth Century to the Present Time. By ANTHONY RINI. New York: Cappabianca Press, 1937. Pp. 181.

This dissertation is better executed than planned. There is no semblance of unity in the subject except the artificial geographical one. Italian manuscripts, editions, translations, and discussions furnish the primary material. The influence on Italian literature seems to have been very slight, though it is not clear how much of it was searched by Rini.

The author seems to be aware of the lack of unity of his subject, for he has "not thought it advisable or useful to treat the subject of the study of Petronius in Italy as an isolated phenomenon" but has in part covered other countries as well, with some curious results. So, for example, after listing the nineteenth-century Italian translations, Rini adds the French, English, and German. Often the discussion of non-Italian work far exceeds that of the Italian.

The dissertation bears the earmarks of being put together from separate notes without sufficient integration. For example, the Messina manuscript is called extant and "is said to belong to the twelfth century" (p. 1). The footnote correctly states that it is lost and probably disappeared between 1866 and 1873. The Paris florilegium 17903 is still quoted as Notre Dame 118 (*sic*, misprint for 188), though Rini must have been aware of their identity. Strangely, too, he fails to mention the other three florilegia which I used, though he quotes frequently from my article.

The Introduction (really the first chapter) briefly covers the subject of Petronius in the Middle Ages, the older manuscripts, and the few Italian *testimonia*. I am wrongly quoted as saying that the earliest Italian florilegium

containing Petronius is Vat. Reg. 1625. It happens to be in Italy now, but like most of the Reginenses probably originated in France. Rini apparently assumed that it had always been in Italy.

In dealing with the fifteenth century, a hitherto unreported manuscript is mentioned from Belluno and several interesting *testimonia* are given. A detailed study of the first two printed editions is of value. The second is clearly a copy of the first, as Rini agrees, but it has some divergences which Rini ascribes to another source, perhaps a manuscript. But he does not prove his case. Spellings like *quaeror* for *queror*, *charissimorum* for *car.*, "the strange form" *obsculum* for *osculum*, etc., are utterly without significance even though they are found in manuscripts. In general the handling of manuscript material is inexpert.

The chapter on the sixteenth century deals mainly with French editions since little was produced in Italy. The following pages give good summaries, usually uncritical, of Petronian material. Somewhere in the book mention may be found of almost every book or article on Petronius. An index would have been useful. The book is too well documented, containing well over a thousand footnotes. The author has himself seen many of the rarer items and corrects some of the misstatements about them that have been perpetuated in literature. It is made clear that France was the chief center of interest in Petronius from the Middle Ages to the eighteenth century (except for Italy in the fifteenth century and partly in the seventeenth). In the nineteenth century the interest spread over Europe and America, and today, Rini points out, Petronius has attained an unprecedented measure of popularity in many countries, both among scholars and among the general public.

B. L. ULLMAN

Tibullo. By NINO SALANITRO. Naples: Luigi Loffredo, 1938. Pp. 193. L. 32.

The purpose of this neatly printed book is to present a general but critical treatment of Tibullus and his work, especially for Italians. The author says that he has not made a mere compilation but has studied the subject independently; he does not claim absolute originality (who could on so well-worn a theme?) or infallibility. We can only agree with this statement.

Chapter i dealing with biographical details, fails to take into account all the literature on the subject and offers nothing new. But then follow some novelties. Sulpicia herself is said to have written iv. 3 and 5, and Tibullus was in love with her (the objections to this fantastic view are scarcely touched). Domitius Marsus wrote the *Vita*; Lygdamus is Ovid (this last is not new or impossible).

The brief chapter on Tibullus' friends also suffers from lack of acquaintance with all the literature. A long footnote defends the originality of Latin literature and gives a good bibliography. Marathus is regarded as a real person and the poems about him as based on real experience. Delia too, of course, and

Nemesis are regarded as real, and the chronology of the love affairs is worked out.

Many details in the poems are discussed. I register here my frequent disagreement, as it is not possible to argue every point. For example, it is suggested that when Tibullus wrote his first elegy, he did not know that Delia was married. The arrangement of elegies in the first book is said to be chronological, except for the fourth elegy. The attractive theory that the second book was published after Tibullus' death is rejected.

The last chapter, on the poetry and art of Tibullus, covers less than five pages. It is, of course, quite general and does not go into a discussion of Tibullian technique.

The book is a useful, though incomplete, summary of the literature; its conclusions do not always reveal sound judgment.

B. L. ULLMAN

The Athenian Assessment of 425 B.C. By BENJAMIN DEAN MERITT and ALLEN BROWN WEST. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1934. Pp. xiv+112.

The present volume, No. XXXIII in the "Humanistic Series of University of Michigan Studies," deals with the Athenian assessment of tribute in the year 425 B.C. It is intended primarily for the advanced specialist in Greek epigraphy. In fact, it confines itself strictly to the study of a single inscription (*IG*, I², 63) which is very significant in the history of the Peloponnesian War and of Athenian financial administration. The first chapter is devoted to a detailed description of the various fragments out of which the inscription has to be reconstructed and is illustrated by excellent photographs of such fragments as are not elsewhere so available. In chapter ii the authors consider, with great technical detail, the many problems involved in placing the known fragments in their proper positions. How difficult the task is, may be seen through studying the diagram and the photograph placed opposite each other on pages 38-39. These preliminary matters being settled, chapter iii presents a reconstructed text of the first part of the inscription (i.e., the two decrees, the rider, and the record of assessment), followed by a translation and by a commentary concerned primarily with epigraphical problems. As the decrees are followed in the inscription by the list of the cities assessed, so in chapter iv the reader is given a reconstructed list of the tribute-paying cities and a commentary upon questions of epigraphy. These four chapters are succeeded by three indexes: the first containing the names of tributary states mentioned in the document; the second giving significant Greek words; and the third a general Index to the whole volume. The book is brought to a close by three plates, the last two of which, printed in red and black, present the problems of epigraphical restoration in a singularly effective and arresting manner.

Very few living scholars would be competent to appraise and criticize in detail the epigraphical technique which Meritt and West employed in reconstructing this inscription; and the present reviewer is certainly not to be included in that number. A student of antiquity, however unversed he may be in the special skills demanded by epigraphy, cannot fail to be impressed and deeply moved by the immense pains and patience and accuracy demanded of the editors, to say nothing of the *εὐστοχία* of their conjectures and restorations. During the spring of 1936 the reviewer was in Athens and personally collated the fragments now preserved in the Epigraphical Museum and detected no error in the transcription.

Since the work is, as has been implied already, chiefly a study in epigraphical technique, there is no extended discussion of the larger historical significance of the document or of its importance as evidence for the financial policy of Cleon. In one respect the restored text, if correct, adds a new feature to Athenian constitutional history. In line 16 of "The Decrees" appear these words: *hoi δὲ [νομοθέται] δικαστέριον νέον κα[θ]ιστάντων*. Even a superficial familiarity with Athenian public law will suggest that this reading pushes the office of *νομοθέται* considerably farther back in the fifth century than the date at which one had previously supposed the office existed (cf., e.g., Glotz: *La Cité grecque*, pp. 386-87). Nevertheless, the inscription was cut with extreme care and no other correction seems to fit so exactly the letter-spaces that are vacant. If final certainty is unattainable, at least an unusually high degree of probability has been achieved.

The typography of the book seems beyond all criticism. Greek and English parts of the text are clearly, spaciouly, and beautifully printed; and the photographic reproductions and the diagrams will long serve as models. Not even Mommsen's edition of the *Res gestae divi Augusti* was more magnificently produced.

From every point of view the volume is one of which American scholars may be justly proud.

STANLEY BARNEY SMITH

Bowdoin College

Der Gebrauch des bestimmten Artikels in der nachklassischen griechischen Epik.
By ARNOLD SVENSSON. Lund: Carl Bloms Buchdruckerei, 1937.

It is rather a pity that so much patient word-counting and classifying should lead to such meager results. Dr. Svensson, a student of A. Wifstrand at Lund, presents in his doctoral dissertation annotated statistics on the use of the definite article in post-classical Greek epic in what he calls an "afektbetonte oder affektbetonend Artikelverbindung" and shows that Apollonius Rhodius and Quintus of Smyrna adhere closely to Homer's practice while Nonnus, for reasons obviously due to his rigid prosodical principles, departs from it. The article becomes progressively rare in later epic; Nonnus

uses it, for instance, only 147 times, or about once in 145 verses—an amazing average for such a vast poem as the *Dionysiaca*. The authors treated are Apollonius Rhodius, Callimachus, the epic poems of the *Corpus Theocriteum*, Quintus of Smyrna, Nonnus, Musaeus, Colluthus, Tryphiodorus, the Orphic *Argonautica*, and a few epic fragments of the Empire; Svensson promises a similar study of didactic epic. Of these, Apollonius and Nonnus receive the greatest amount of space. Two appendixes are devoted to a discussion of the stylistic value in epic of certain personal appellatives (γένων, ξείνος, ἀνὴρ, ἄνθρωπος) with the article, and a special use of pronominal ὁ ἡ τό.

There are some useful remarks on the stylistic use of the article in connection with nouns, pronouns, pronominal adjectives, and with adverbial expressions, especially where it is "emotionell bedingt." The study leads occasionally to the defense of certain readings and emendations but to no original emendations by the author. A number of heretofore unnoticed reminiscences, parallels, and imitations are pointed out, although in this regard there is far too much guessing indicated by the words *wahrscheinlich* and *vielleicht*. The echo of Homer in Nonnus (*Dion.* xxv. 394) is already listed, however, in Ludwich's apparatus. In general, the study is of limited usefulness and confines itself too closely to mere classification and statistics to allow much discussion of the syntax involved in many instances. Its chief result is the confirmation by exhaustive inspection of the generally known emotional force of the Greek article—another proof, if one were needed, of the complex and delicate function of the slightest words in the Greek language.

L. R. LIND

Wabash College

Monumenta Asiae Minoris antiqua, Vol. V: *Monuments from Dorylaeum and Nacolea*. Edited by C. W. M. COX and A. CAMERON. ("Publications of the American Society for Archaeological Research in Asia Minor.") Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1937. Pp. lii+201+64 plates. 40s.

The volumes in this series describing the monuments above ground in Asia Minor gather and preserve much material valuable to specialists in many fields, but they should appeal also to students with merely a general interest in things Roman and Hellenistic. They are put up attractively with good print and excellent plates and are not too heavy to be enjoyed in an easy chair. If the reader is in the mood, he can play with attempts at solving some of the difficulties involved; if he is not, he will find a great deal that can be read easily, and somewhere, whether his interests center primarily on linguistics, art, political institutions, or religion, he will find something he can use. Of course, the interest will be increased by a reading of several or all of them, for, devoted as each volume is to a limited area, this will bring out clearly local differences.

The district of Phrygia Epictetus covered by the present volume is inter-

esting as one in which there are few traces of Christianity before Constantine and in which the vitality of paganism is shown both by the numerous dedications and by the practice of giving the names of Greek gods to humans (list under No. 35). A result of this practice is that it at times is difficult to determine whether a specific name refers to a god or to a human. The most frequently mentioned god is Zeus Bronton; of interest is *Μητρι Κυβέλη* (No. 213), the second known occurrence of this name in an inscription. The student of political institutions will find only odds and ends, though some of them very interesting: there is one reference to a *gerousia* (No. 86), one to a *phyle* and its officials at Nacolea (No. 204), and one to a *trikomia* on the territory of Dorylaeum (No. 87); the frequent mention of villages indicates the solidarity of villages; No. 60, if correctly interpreted, is a boundary stone between the territories of Dorylaeum and Nicaea and thus helps to show the great extent of the territory of the latter city. The many prayers on behalf of herds throw light on economic conditions, though the presence of herds in this region hardly is news. Aside from the inscriptions probably the most interesting monuments described are the many doorstones with low reliefs; one of the objects frequently represented is thought to be a writing tablet (discussed under No. 41).

The volume is so planned as to be very convenient for students who wish to go beyond the material contained in it. A bibliography and concordance of inscriptions from the area published in other works is given as well as a table of inscriptions connected with the cult of Zeus Bronton. There is a useful series of indexes.

J. A. O. LARSEN

University of Chicago

Portrait of Socrates. By SIR R. W. LIVINGSTONE. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1938. Pp. lvi+200 with one plate. \$2.50.

The subtitle of the volume, "Being the *Apology*, *Crito*, and *Phaedo* of Plato in an English Translation with Introductions and Notes," indicates the scope of the work. Believing that English readers, too, need explanatory material, the editor (who is one of the more prolific members of that company which endeavors to interpret ancient Greece to the modern world) has annotated Jowett's translation (slightly modified) with footnotes and with analyses and comments at the heads of the logical divisions. This commentary, though lively and full of contemporary allusions, is not unduly "streamlined." The statement (p. 29, n. 1) that the *δαιμόνιον* was always negative should have at least mentioned Xenophon's version (*Mem.* i. 1. 4), since his views are elsewhere considered.

One wishes that the editor had included the first member of the tetralogy. Although the *Euthyphro* is not one of the popular minor dialogues and though a discussion of piety might at first thought repel the modern reader, neverthe-

less, the *Euthyphro* shows clearly and briefly Socrates' method not only of philosophic inquiry but of making himself unpopular as well. This dialogue paints, more vividly than any introduction can, the background for Socrates' trial and death, and its brevity should make its inclusion possible.

HAROLD B. DUNKEL

University of Chicago

Sparte. By PIERRE ROUSSEL. Paris: E. de Boccard, 1939. Pp. 216+16 pls.

This is a type of work which the French can do so well: an attractive paper cover, an adequate sketch-map, well-chosen illustrations, and a popular text. The story is inevitably cast in a conventional framework; Dorian conquest follows a bit of prehistory; Sparta's expansion, her social and political institutions, Lycurgus, the Persian and Peloponnesian wars, and the centuries down to the Roman conquest—all are here. But every page is a witness to Roussel's personality and ability. As a good historian he knows how to throw the salient points into high relief and how to cut through controversial problems, not, however, without making the reader aware of their existence. It is a delight to find that due attention has been given to archaic Sparta, to geography, to Tyrtaeus, and to the British excavations at the sanctuary of Artemis Orthia. Roussel also knows how to make his story interesting and at times exciting, even though there are moments when we might ask for less personal opinion and a more careful weighing of the evidence. He has set out to explain a city which was the very incarnation of the ideal of military courage, frugal life, obedience, and discipline; at the end we have to agree that much mystery still clings to the name of Sparta.

C. A. ROBINSON, JR.

Brown University

De Menandri comici codice in patriarchali bibliotheca Constantinopolitana olim asservato. By GUSTAVUS PRZYCHOCKI. ("Polska akademia umiejtności, *Archiwum filologiczne*," No. 13.) Cracoviae: Gebethner & Wolff, 1938. Pp. 46; 2 pls.

Was there once in the patriarchal library at Constantinople a codex containing all the twenty-four comedies of Menander with exegesis by Michael Psellus? This article maintains that there was and gives a text with facsimiles of two pages of the booklist (Cod. Vind. hist. Gr. 98, olim 49) that Przychocki believes to be a genuine statement of contents of the library. He also believes that the plays of Menander may yet be found lurking in some unconsidered codex of the Stammerer. This is a thrilling hope, and it is impossible to prove a negative; but, even if such a volume once existed, it seems almost certain that fire or other hazard destroyed it long ago.

L. A. POST

Haverford College

BOOKS RECEIVED

- Die Antike: Zeitschrift für Kunst und Kultur des klassischen Altertums*, Band XV, Heft 3. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co., 1939.
- BOURBERE, CONST. I. H ΕΘΝΙΚΗ ΣΤΕΙΛΗΣΙΣ ΤΟΤ ΠΑΑΤΩΝΟΣ. Athens, 1939. Pp. 52.
- COHOON, J. W. (ed. and trans.). *Dio Chrysostom*, Vol. II. ("Loeb Classical Library.") Cambridge: Harvard University Press; London: William Heinemann, 1939. Pp. vi+441.
- COLSON, F. H. (ed. and trans.). *Philo*, Vol. VIII. ("Loeb Classical Library.") Cambridge: Harvard University Press; London: William Heinemann, 1939. Pp. xxiv+458.
- COLWELL, ERNEST CADMAN, and MANTEY, JULIUS R. *A Hellenistic Greek Reader: Selections from the Koine of the New Testament Period, with Vocabulary and Notes*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1939. Pp. xv+229. \$2.00.
- CORBETT, JAMES. *Manuscripts des bibliothèques publiques de Paris antérieurs au XVII^e siècle*. ("Catalogue des manuscrits alchimiques latins," Vol. 1.) Bruxelles: Palais des académies, 1939. Pp. 367.
- DEUTSCH, ROSAMUND E. *The Pattern of Sound in Lucretius*. (Diss., Bryn Mawr.) Pp. viii+188.
- DONNELLY, FRANCIS P., S.J. *Cicero's Manilian Law: A Rhetorical Commentary*. ("Fordham University Classics.") New York: Fordham University Press, 1939. Pp. x+93. \$0.75.
- DOWNEY, GLANVILLE. *A Study of the Comites Orientis and the Comites Syriae*. (Diss., Princeton.) Princeton, 1939. Pp. 22.
- EVANS, ELIZABETH C. *The Cults of the Sabine Territory*. ("Papers and Monographs of the American Academy in Rome," Vol. XI.) Rome: American Academy in Rome, 1939. Pp. xv+254+7 pls.
- GEEREBAERT, A., S.J. *Selections from the Greek Lyric Poets*. English ed. by P. COLLIN, S.J. In two parts. New York: Fordham University Press, 1939. Pp. 72 and x+153. \$1.00.
- GÖHLER, JOSEF. *Rom und Italien: Die römische Bundesgenossenpolitik von den Anfängen bis zum Bundesgenossenkrieg*. ("Breslauer historische Forschungen," Heft 13.) Breslau: Verlag Priebatschs Buchhandlung, 1939. Pp. ix+217. Kart, Rm. 10; geb., Rm. 12.50.
- GRAY, LOUIS H. *Foundations of Language*. New York: Macmillan Co., 1939. Pp. xv+530. \$7.50.
- GREENE, WILLIAM CHASE (ed.). *Scholia Platonica contulerunt atque investigaverunt Fredericus de Forest Allen, Ioannes Burnet, Carolus Pomeroy Parker. Omnia recognita praefatione indicibusque instructa edidit Guilielmus Chase Greene*. ("Philological Monographs," No. VIII). Haverford, Pa.: American Philological Assoc., 1938. Pp. xlii+569. \$4.00.

- GUTHRIE, W. K. C. (ed. and trans.). *Aristotle: On the Heavens*. ("Loeb Classical Library.") Cambridge: Harvard University Press; London: William Heinemann, 1939. Pp. xxxvi+379.
- HAGENDAHL, HARALD. *La "Comédie" latine au XII^e siècle et ses modèles antiques*. (Reprint from ΔΡΑΓΜΑ: Martinio P. Nilsson a. d. IV Id. Iul. anno MCMXXXIX dedicatum.) Pp. 222-55.
- LEVY, HARRY L. *A Latin Reader for Colleges*. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1939. Pp. x+264. \$2.25.
- LINDSKOG, CL., and ZIEGLER, K. (eds.). *Plutarchi vitae parallelae*, Vol. IV, fasc. 2: *Indices*. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1939. Pp. xxxvi+266. Geh., Rm. 9.20; geb., Rm. 10.40.
- LUCAS, F. L. (trans.). *A Greek Garland: A Selection from the Palatine Anthology*. London, New York, and Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1939. Pp. xvii+105. \$1.75.
- MENDNER, SIEGFRIED. *Der Text der Metamorphosen Ovids*. (Diss., Köln.) Bochum-Langendreer: Heinrich Pöppinghaus o. H.-G., 1939.
- MÜLLER, SIEGFRIED. *Das Verhältnis von Apuleius "De mundo" zu seiner Vorlage*. (*Philologus*, Supplementband XXXII, Heft 2.) Leipzig: Dieterich'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1939. Pp. 179. Rm. 11.
- MURRAY, A. T. (ed. and trans.). *Demosthenes, Private Orations*, Vol. II. ("Loeb Classical Library.") Cambridge: Harvard University Press; London: William Heinemann, 1939. Pp. viii+419.
- MURRAY, GILBERT (trans.). *Aeschylus, "The Persians" ["Persae"]*. Translated into English rhyming verse with Preface and notes. New York: Oxford University Press, 1939. Pp. 92. \$1.00.
- NAIRN, J. A. *Classical Hand-List*. Edited by B. H. BLACKWELL, Ltd. 2d ed., rev. and enl. Oxford: B. H. Blackwell, Ltd., 1939. Pp. 266. 4s. 6d. (interleaved, 6s.).
- NITTIS, SAVAS. *The Hippocratic Oath in Reference to Lithotomy: A New Interpretation with Historical Notes on Castration*. (Reprint from *Bulletin of the History of Medicine*, VII [1939], 719-28.)
- OLDFATHER, C. H. (ed. and trans.). *Diodorus of Sicily*, Vol. III: *Books IV (continued) 59-VIII*. ("Loeb Classical Library.") Cambridge: Harvard University Press; London: William Heinemann, 1939. Pp. 433+2 maps.
- OWEN, E. T. *The Oresteia of Aeschylus*. (Reprint from *University of Toronto Quarterly*, Vol. VIII, No. 4 [July, 1939].)
- PACKER, MARY N. PORTER. *Cicero's Presentation of Epicurean Ethics: A Study Based Primarily on "De finibus" I and II*. (Diss., Columbia University.) New York: Columbia University Press, 1938. Pp. ix+127.
- PREISWERK, ANDREAS. *Das Einzelne bei Platon und Aristoteles*. (*Philologus*, Supplementband XXXII, Heft 1.) Leipzig: Dieterich'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1939. Pp. ix+196. Rm. 11.
- PREMERSTEIN, ANTON VON. *Alexandrinische Geronten vor Kaiser Gaius: Ein neues Bruchstück der sogenannten Alexandrinischen Märtyrer-Akten*. (*P. bibl. univ. Giss.* 46.) ("Mitteilungen aus der Papyrussammlung der Giessener Universitätsbibliothek," Vol. V.) Giessen: Verlag von Münchowsche Universitäts-Druckerei, 1939. Pp. iii+71+11 pls.

- ROLFE, JOHN C. (ed. and trans.). *Ammianus Marcellinus*, Vol. III. ("Loeb Classical Library.") Cambridge: Harvard University Press; London: William Heinemann, 1939. Pp. ix+602+2 maps.
- SABBADINI, SALVATORE. *Augusto, Mecenate e propulsore delle lettere e delle arti*. (Reprint from *Annali della R. Università di Trieste*, Vol. IX [1937-38].) Trieste: R. Università di Trieste, 1937. Pp. 19.
- SAGE, EVAN T. (†), and SCHLESINGER, ALFRED C. (ed. and trans.). *Livy*, Vol. XII: *Books XL-XLIII*. ("Loeb Classical Library.") Cambridge: Harvard University Press; London: William Heinemann, 1938. Pp. ix+521+4 maps.
- SCHMITZ-KAHLMANN, GISELA. *Das Beispiel der Geschichte im politischen Denken des Isokrates*. (*Philologus*, Supplementband XXXI, Heft 4.) Leipzig: Dietrich'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1939. Pp. xii+130. Rm. 8.
- SIEGERT, HANS K. *Die Syntax der Tempora und Modi der ältesten lateinischen Inschriften (bis zum Tode Caesars)*. (Diss., Munich.) Würzburg: K. J. Triltsch, 1939. Pp. x+72.
- STEIDLE, WOLF. *Studien zur Ars poetica des Horaz: Interpretation des auf Dichtkunst und Gedicht bezüglichen Hauptteiles*. (Diss., Berlin.) Würzburg-Aumühle: Konrad Triltsch, 1939. Pp. 147. Rm. 4.50.
- TANZER, HELEN H. *The Common People of Pompeii: A Study of the Graffiti*. ("Johns Hopkins University Studies in Archaeology," No. 29.) Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1939. Pp. xii+113. \$3.00.
- Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, Vol. LXIX (1938). Lancaster, Pa.: Lancaster Press; Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1939. Pp. vi+574+cxix+27 pls. \$4.00.
- TURNER, ERIC G. (ed.). *Catalogue of Greek and Latin Papyri and Ostraca in the Possession of the University of Aberdeen*. ("Aberdeen University Studies," No. 116.) Aberdeen: University Press, 1939. Pp. xix+116+5 pls. 8/6.
- WALZER, R. (ed. and trans.). *Eracito: raccolta dei frammenti e traduzione italiana*. ("Testi della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa," Vol. IV.) Firenze: G. C. Sansoni, 1939. Pp. viii+157. L. 30.
- WARMINGTON, E. H. (ed. and trans.). *Remains of Old Latin*, Vol. III: *Lucilius, the Twelve Tables*. ("Loeb Classical Library.") Cambridge: Harvard University Press; London: William Heinemann, 1938. Pp. xxxiii+550.
- WOLFF, HANS JULIUS. *Written and Unwritten Marriages in Hellenistic and Post-classical Roman Law*. ("Philological Monographs," No. IX.) Haverford, Pa.: American Philological Assoc., 1939. Pp. vii+128. \$1.50.
- Yale Classical Studies*, Vol. VI. New Haven: Yale University Press; London: Oxford University Press, 1939. Pp. 167+1 pl. \$2.00.

